

KODIAK/ALEUTIANS SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING

October 14, 1998

DAYS INN CONFERENCE ROOM
Anchorage, Alaska

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mark Olsen, Chairman
Vince Tutiakoff, Vice Chairman
Alfred Cratty, Jr.,
Gilda Shellikoff
Paul Gunderson
Pete Squartsoff
Ivan Lukin
John Foster

Regional Coordinator:

Clifford Edenshaw

0002

P R O C E E D I N G S

(On record - 9:00 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Good morning everybody. I guess at this time we'll call this meeting to order. I see Gilda is not available here for taking roll call, Cliff, will you please do the honors.

MR. EDENSHAW: Good morning Mr. Chair. Mark Olsen.

CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes.

MR. EDENSHAW: Vince Tutiakoff.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Here.

MR. EDENSHAW: Alfred Cratty.

MR. CRATTY: Here.

MR. EDENSHAW: Pete Squartsoff.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Here.

MR. EDENSHAW: Gilda Shellikoff. Absent. Paul Gunderson.

MR. GUNDERSON: Here.

MR. EDENSHAW: Della Trumble. Absent. John Foster.

MR. FOSTER: Here.

MR. EDENSHAW: And Irving Reft on the bottom has resigned and I have not received a letter from him. Gilda Shellikoff called me, we've been communicating. She's here in town with meetings with the State, and she said she'd be here when the meeting adjourns and that would be sometime this morning. And Della Trumble called me yesterday and she's ill so she is unable to fly so she's back home.

CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. Then they look like at a reasonable absence at this time.

MR. EDENSHAW: And Ivan Lukin is sitting in place of -- in lieu of Irving Reft's -- once we receive an official letter. I drafted a letter and mailed it to Karluk for him to sign and until that's received, Ivan will be serving in his absence until next year when nominations period kicks off again at the

0003

1 beginning of the new year. So that position will be filled next
2 calendar year in September when nominations -- the whole process
3 starts again.

4
5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Cliff. I guess we do have a
6 quorum established. At this time I'd like to welcome everybody
7 here again. For those who do not know each other, we have Robert
8 Stovall, Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. Robert Willis is
9 here with us. Ray Portwood, Izembek. Liz Andrews, ADF&G. Lynn
10 Schwarz from Kodiak, ADF&G. And we also have Corey Wilson from
11 King Cove here with this morning. Is there anybody I forgot
12 here? Oh, Rachel, excuse me. Rachel Mason, of course, how could
13 I forget.

14
15 So welcome here. I know this has been a meeting that has
16 been rescheduled and things have changed a little bit which we
17 are going to go through today. So I guess with that we'd like to
18 review the adoption of the agenda. Cliff, I believe.....

19
20 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Now, before I get
21 into that, I'd like to welcome John Foster from Sand Point as the
22 newly appointed Council member and Pete Squartsoff. And we have
23 Michael Swetzoff who is the other alternate, but in lieu of last
24 year when Regional Council recommended that they have alternates,
25 they said the alternate from the Aleutians would attend that
26 meeting and vice versa, that the alternate from Kodiak, and
27 seeing that Kodiak was closest to Anchorage, Ivan came in town
28 from Kodiak. But Michael Swetzoff, you know, he was going to
29 come here but he said that he'd been traveling too much so in
30 lieu of that -- if you open your books under Tab B is the agenda.
31 Initially on September 15th, that's what it states on here, the
32 meeting was canceled but we're utilizing the same -- with the
33 exceptions of the date on there. The 1:00 o'clock, training,
34 numbers 1 through 5, those will be omitted today. We're not
35 going to do any training this morning or this afternoon. We'll
36 go ahead and move down to 1 through 5 are pretty much self-
37 explanatory. Six, the election of officers. Seven, any public
38 comments here; individuals may choose to step up to the table
39 here and give testimony regarding the Federal Subsistence
40 program. Proposals, we'll get into those -- I have you -- if you
41 go on to the following page under old business, Mr. Portwood here
42 is the assistant refuge manager, Izembek and he'll be here to
43 answer any questions the Council may have regarding caribou or
44 brown bear or any of the surveys, he's here to answer those.
45 Robert Stovall's here from the refuge. And in front of you, I
46 provided the Council with an updated version that Robert faxed to
47 me yesterday regarding the reports for the Kodiak Refuge. Of
48 course Liz Andrews is here and Glen for any questions the Council
49 may have regarding some of the working agreements they have
50 conducted on Units 9(D) and 10 regarding caribou as well as Unit

0004

1 10. Larry VanDale, I spoke with him -- or he sent me an E-mail
2 and stated that in lieu of the short meeting he was going to go
3 ahead and hold off on coming here to Anchorage. The next item,
4 the Joint Chairs meeting. There should have been a handout or
5 there should be a copy inside the booklet regarding the meeting
6 last year or this last year in May that Mark attended. The Board
7 meeting, those are just .805 responses I can go into. Fifteen,
8 Fisheries update. Taylor Brelsford is going to be here this
9 afternoon so we'll be here to give an update on that. Charters,
10 I can go ahead and give a report on that here under number 16.
11 Number 17, I was speaking with Vince earlier regarding c&t task
12 force, Rachel Mason will go ahead and -- with the Council's
13 indulgence, we'll bump that back up to the top here under old
14 business. Then Rod King, I'm not sure if Rod King's made it in
15 this morning or not. He's supposed to be here giving a migratory
16 bird survey which the Council requested over a year ago.

17
18 Yes, Vincent.

19
20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: As to translocation, the information
21 moved up behind Rachel?

22
23 MR. EDENSHAW: Uh-huh.

24
25 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Following her report.

26
27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Under new business?

28
29 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Yeah, under old business.

30
31 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay. And that's if -- he's -- I haven't
32 seen him yet.

33
34 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Well, if does show up.

35
36 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay. And then Special Action request,
37 that's just action that the Board took on -- that was regarding
38 the caribou hunt on Units 9(B) and 10 for this past year. So
39 that's it in terms of the agenda.

40
41 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Is there any other changes to the
42 agenda?

43
44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I asked Cliff to -- I know we're going to
45 discuss it and that's the Federal Subsistence activities that's
46 been happening in the last couple of days, the information that
47 was put out recently.

48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That was on the front page of the paper
50 this morning.

0005
1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I asked that to be a topic of discussion.
2 If it does effect the Advisory Boards and funding, I would like
3 to address that as being an item.
4
5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Where would you like to carry that then?
6
7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: It's underneath -- we were going to
8 discuss it under 15.
9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. Is there any other changes,
11 corrections or deletions? Hearing none, I would entertain a
12 motion to accept the agenda as discussed.
13
14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: So moved.
15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Moved. Do I hear a second?
17
18 MR. CRATTY: Second.
19
20 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Moved and seconded. Anymore discussion?
21
22 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.
23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Question's been called. Those in favor
25 signify by aye.
26
27 IN UNISON: Aye.
28
29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Those opposed.
30
31 (No opposing votes)
32
33 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. With that, I guess we will see
34 where we are at. Okay, adoption of the minutes from March 5th
35 you should find under Tab C. At this time is there any changes
36 as noted by the minutes from our previous meeting of March 5th
37 and 6th which was held in Kodiak? Do we need a little time here
38 to go through the minutes?
39
40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'll move to adopt the minutes of March
41 5th and 6th.
42
43 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: It's been moved, do I hear a second?
44
45 MR. CRATTY: Second.
46
47 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Moved and seconded. Any discussion.
48
49 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.
50

0006

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Question's been called. Those in favor
2 of accepting the minutes of March 5th and 6th signify by aye.

3
4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5
6 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Those opposed.

7
8 (No opposing votes)

9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess at this time we need to go
11 through the process of election of our officers. Cliff, I would
12 ask if you would handle this for us please.

13
14 MR. EDENSHAW: Excuse me?

15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Election of officers.

17
18 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, the.....

19
20 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: How would we like to handle that?

21
22 MR. EDENSHAW: The position of Chair is a one year
23 appointment And there's a quorum present and the only one that's
24 absent is Gilda, but you know, you may proceed.

25
26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion
27 to adopt the Chairman, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer to
28 keep status quo rather than going through the process of voting
29 each membership.

30
31 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Request by block. Is there any
32 opposition to this? Hearing none it -- does it take a unanimous
33 consent?

34
35 MR. EDENSHAW: Yes.

36
37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you again. All those -- I hear a
38 motion, do I hear a second to the motion?

39
40 MR. GUNDERSON: I'll second it.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Moved and seconded. Anymore discussion?

43
44 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Question.

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Question's been called. All those in
47 favor signify by aye.

48
49 IN UNISON: Aye.

50

0007
1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Those opposed by the same sign.
2
3 (No opposing votes)
4
5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Hearing none, so be it.
6
7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: So for the record, names to these
8 positions. Was it Gilda, Secretary?
9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: As I recall it is.
11
12 MR. EDENSHAW: That's correct. Vince Tutiakoff, Vice
13 Chair and Mark Olsen as Chair.
14
15 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay, that's moving nice and smooth.
16 And now, we're to the next day -- no, I'm just teasing you. At
17 this time we are under 7, public comments on the Federal
18 Subsistence Management program.
19
20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I wonder if this is a -- Mr. Chair, if
21 this is an appropriate place to, maybe not, to discuss the
22 actions on the newspapers or is that going to be addressed as a
23 separate item? Are we going to come out of here with any action
24 is what I'm asking? Recommendation or otherwise?
25
26 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I certainly.
27
28 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Does the coordinator have any input?
29
30 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chair, Taylor was going to provide
31 some information this afternoon regarding that issue.
32
33 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Okay, I'll wait until Mr. Taylor shows
34 up.
35
36 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. He will be here then probably to
37 discuss that under item 15?
38
39 MR. EDENSHAW: That's correct.
40
41 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay, we're going to hold him to it
42 then.
43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay.
45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Is there any other comment here on the
47 Federal Management system as we know it today? Hearing none we
48 will move on to new business, open floor to change Federal
49 Subsistence regulations. Do we have any proposals here from the
50 public that we're aware of Cliff?

0008

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: That have been submitted?

2

3 MR. GUNDERSON: We've got one from Nelson Lagoon that
4 came out by the State Advisory Committee for a possible moose
5 hunt in Unit 9(D). And the meeting was held just a short time
6 before coming to town so none of the stuff had been put out as of
7 -- I got a copy of it in my booklet here that I was going to run
8 off some copies for everybody so they could take a look at it and
9 we could maybe discuss it or something and see if it's got any
10 merit.

11

12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Was this the meeting that was held in
13 Naknek?

14

15 MR. GUNDERSON: No. This was a meeting that was held in
16 Nelson Lagoon by the local advisory committee.

17

18 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay.

19

20 MR. EDENSHAW: In what unit Paul?

21

22 MR. GUNDERSON: 9(D).

23

24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: 9(D).

25

26 MR. EDENSHAW: 9(D).

27

28 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, Vince.

29

30 MR. TUTIAKOFF: There will be a proposal for a c&t
31 decision that I'll be submitting in regards to Adak Caribou Herd
32 for subsistence hunts. I haven't completed it but I will have it
33 turned in for the date -- October 23rd is the final date for any
34 proposals which is the process for any subsistence management
35 program. So I will be submitting one for Adak on the caribou
36 herd after discussion with Mr. Boone in regards to translocation
37 also.

38

39 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, I believe that's the -- basically
40 dealing with the herd that was left on Adak and what's going to
41 happen to these animals so they don't end up like a Hagemeister?

42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Right. And right now their present
44 position is a year-round hunt. We are in the process, as many of
45 you may be aware of of the Aleut Corporation taking over a
46 majority or a big portion of Adak, the Naval facility, and we've
47 asked for also a co-management proposal to takeover the herd at
48 Adak with the fish and wildlife, so we're in that process. And
49 negotiations regarding the transfer of property will include co-
50 management of the management herd -- of the herd at Adak. So

0009

1 these things are all happening kind of together. So as part of
2 that I'm going to submit a c&t on the caribou herd.

3
4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you Vince. I know from -- I plan
5 to have a proposal in for the subsistence of taking of salmon
6 from the Kodiak area. And basically what it is is that with the
7 growth of Kodiak here, that the Buskin River has now become -- I
8 don't know if anybody yet has -- I know I have subsistence fished
9 out there this spring and it is getting very, very cluttered and
10 very much use, I k now that in Kodiak they have taken away other
11 traditional subsistence grounds, such as the Mission Beach and
12 the Mill Bay area which is now sport fishing only. I think that
13 is in conflict, contrary to the subsistence management. So I
14 will be, myself, be putting this proposal in before the deadline
15 as well.

16
17 Is there any other Council proposals that we'd like to
18 note at this time? That takes us to number 3 here, agency
19 proposals. I see as we have in our tab here now, we have two
20 proposals from the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. Robert,
21 would you like to enlight us on this please?

22
23 MR. STOVALL: This is Robert Stovall with the Kodiak
24 National Wildlife Refuge. The Kodiak Refuge has submitted two
25 proposals dealing with the Federal subsistence bear hunt. In
26 general, the first proposal is a follow-up to the original
27 writing of the hunt regulations and would be included in the
28 underneath the possession and transportation of wildlife sealing
29 of bear skins and skulls portion of the Federal subsistence
30 regulations. And in short, it would include the following: The
31 regulation would read, if the skin or skull of a brown bear taken
32 in GMU 8 is removed from Unit 8, it must first be sealed by
33 Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge staff. And at the tie of this
34 sealing, the Refuge staff will remove and retain the skin of the
35 skull and front claws of the bear.

36
37 This was part of the original proposal that was written
38 up. And through the process of getting it approved it was
39 somehow -- did not follow through into the regulation process.
40 So the suggestion was that we go ahead and make a proposal out of
41 it.

42
43 The second proposal is a proposal that would be
44 underneath the special provisions in the regulations. And simply
45 stated it's, non-residents may not accompany Federal subsistence
46 registration permit bear hunters into the field. Only Alaska
47 residents and/or blood relatives may be in the field with permit
48 holders. This was to ensure the Federal subsistence hunts are
49 not in competition with resident guides for the bears -- for
50 taking of the bears.

00010

1 That's probably all I wanted to say on them. I'm open to
2 questions if you have any.

3
4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I got a question here. Here you have at
5 the time of the sealing, the Refuge staff will remove and retain
6 the skin of the skull and front claws of the bear. What is --
7 number 1, is this consistent with the other taking of brown bear,
8 such as commercial or sport taking or as we know it as a trophy
9 hunt?

10
11 MR. STOVALL: Right.

12
13 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'm just aware that other parts of the
14 bear are customary and traditionally taken and used in the past.

15
16 MR. STOVALL: Right. Those inedible parts of the bear,
17 especially the claws will be retained by the Refuge and upon
18 request will be allowed back to the individual villages. And
19 this only goes into effect if the skin is planned on being taken
20 out of the region. Chances are probably to have it tanned.

21
22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: What you're saying is if like somebody
23 took a subsistence bear and they wanted to ship the skin out to
24 have it tanned, that the claws and the head have to be cut off?

25
26 MR. STOVALL: Right.

27
28 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Before it could be tanned?

29
30 MR. STOVALL: Right.

31
32 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure, Robert, go ahead please -- Mr.
33 Willis.

34
35 MR. WILLIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Robert Willis, Fish
36 and Wildlife Service Anchorage. I need to point out that as the
37 regulation now stands, sealing is required for subsistence bears
38 taken on Kodiak Island. This is something that we specifically
39 put in that regulation when we created it. If you'll note, Page
40 17 of the regulations book specie in which areas sealing is not
41 required unless the hide is taken out of that unit. The Kodiak
42 area is not one of those exceptions listed. So in this new
43 proposal, there's no reason to specify that the sealing
44 requirement exists because it already exists in the regulation.

45
46 MR. STOVALL: Essentially this will just allow that if
47 the skin is removed for the -- it's already going to be sealed.
48 Every subsistence bear taken is sealed as it is. If the skin is
49 planned on being taken out of the area, and the area being Game
50 Management Unit 8, then it would be required to have the skin of

00011

1 the skull and the claws -- bear paws retained by Refuge staff.

2

3 If there is a need to have the claws for handicrafts or
4 other things of that nature, then those can be given back.

5

6 MR. CRATTY: Mr. Chair.

7

8 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Al.

9

10 MR. CRATTY: Just to be tanned or.....

11

12 MR. STOVALL: Yes.

13

14 MR. CRATTY:if you were going to have it tanned in
15 Unit 8, can you.....

16

17 MR. STOVALL: If you're going to have it tanned in Unit
18 8 then there's no need to take it out. There's no need to have
19 the skin of the skull and the claws removed.

20

21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: What is -- I'm trying to figure out,
22 what is the purpose then of it if it's already tagged or stamped;
23 then this skin is already identified? Why do we want to take
24 parts that no other user group is required to do? I find that
25 very lopsided.

26

27 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, the idea is that a subsistence
28 taken bear is not taken for its trophy value. And if the skin is
29 to be taken outside the unit, then the trophy value would be
30 destroyed. This is the idea behind that regulation.

31

32 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I don't know, I personally feel that
33 that is really taking away from -- I mean if we were going to
34 make a bear rug, would you buy -- I mean would you take a rug
35 that has no head or no feet on it? I don't -- I don't know, I'd
36 like to hear from the Council on this.

37

38 MR. CRATTY: I'd like to say something. I'm just saying,
39 traditional or culture, you know, they use it as -- in dances or
40 something, I think they'd want the claws and the heads still on
41 it. I'd just like to fit my opinion in on that.

42

43 MR. WILLIS: I think the idea is that subsistence taken
44 bears traditionally were not sent to Seattle or Anchorage or
45 somewhere to have them tanned, rather they were tanned by the
46 people in the village and then used for ceremonial purposes.
47 Certainly that still is allowed. It's only if it's taken outside
48 the unit that the claws and the skin of the skull would be
49 removed.

50

00012

1 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

2
3 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, Vince.

4
5 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Maybe for my information since, you know,
6 I'm not a user of the bears and whatever, the skins, but how many
7 tanneries are there in Kodiak that are available to the
8 communities involved here, in the Kodiak community? Nobody
9 knows?

10
11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I don't know of any.

12
13 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And what has been the traditional use in
14 the past; is that to -- I mean up through, say 1970 or '71; is
15 that done in the communities by the individuals?

16
17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, we had.....

18
19 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I'm trying to figure out why this rule is
20 being implemented other than to divert from commercial or say
21 trophy use once it gets out of the community. Is that out of
22 8(D), is that what you're saying; to prevent that from happening?

23
24 MR. STOVALL: That's primarily why we wanted the
25 regulation in.

26
27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I still have a little problem here,
28 Robert. I would think that, at least, for tanning, should be an
29 exception to at least be sent out and tanned. I mean aren't they
30 already tagged before they go out to the tannery. I'm trying to
31 get to the meat of what we plan to achieve by discarding or
32 taking off claws and heads?

33
34 MR. STOVALL: It speaks back to the possibility that
35 bears that are taken for subsistence are used, not that the skins
36 are, at least, not used as a part of the -- are used for more
37 than subsistence purposes would be rugs and other types of things
38 of that nature. And the chances are that they would -- that they
39 were traditionally hand tanned in the village. When you allow it
40 out of the village to be tanned, then there's a possibility that
41 they could be used to -- sold, especially, you know, high
42 standard quality tanning processes that are being used. Might be
43 used as mounts to make a trophy level, and that wasn't the intent
44 of a subsistence taken bear on Kodiak Island. That was to
45 provide for food and handicrafts.

46
47 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I believe the sealing process is the
48 instrument that we used to discourage this kind of activity to
49 begin with. I'm just -- as I look back at it, I do realize that
50 the tribal community uses many of these parts of the animals,

00013

1 such as their dance and different arts and crafts. If that has
2 to be done, I think, it could be done by the subsistence user as
3 that as -- I don't think it's my discretion to say what parts
4 they can use and what parts they can't use as subsistence.

5
6 MR. STOVALL: Uh-huh.

7
8 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: And that's basically what we're saying
9 in this proposal.

10
11 MR. STOVALL: If, in deed, they are going to use those
12 portions that would be removed, then they would have an
13 opportunity to get those portions back from the Refuge. Because
14 we would retain them and then when requested we'd probably give
15 them right out -- right back.

16
17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Ida, did I see you motion to comment?
18 Please.

19
20 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, Staff Committee member
21 for the BIA. I just wanted to comment on subsistence use of bear
22 hide. Subsistence use was not just eating the bear. The hide
23 was used for sleeping materials and, although we didn't call them
24 rugs, they were used as rugs. So I would hope that the Council
25 would express some of the uses of your region. There were --
26 claws were used for various medicine purposes and other purposes
27 in my region, but you should, on record, state what are the uses
28 from your region -- traditional uses.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, thank you, Ida. That's my concern
31 here. As we all well know, the suppression of taking of bear for
32 subsistence has been in effect for so many years and we are just
33 now trying to come back and I don't -- I'm having a hard time.
34 I don't know how much of the skull you want or -- and definitely
35 I'm more interested in the claws that they have many ceremonial
36 and other traditional purposes that they can be just as well
37 taken by the subsistence user or cut off or donated to the
38 tribals. I just -- it's just another suppression, I feel.

39
40 MR. STOVALL: Only the skin of the skull would be
41 removed. The rest of the -- the skull of course would be
42 retained in the village and used for whatever purposes. Also the
43 claws, of course, would be once again returned to each village
44 upon request. The Refuge will actually just maintain a
45 repository of them and then when the request of those claws,
46 would be returned back to each village.

47
48 It would just be the.....

49
50 MR. FOSTER: The claws wouldn't have to be removed would

00014

1 they, if you're just sending the skin out or if you take the
2 skull and claws off yourself and just kept them in the area, you
3 wouldn't have to turn it into.....

4

5 MR. STOVALL: That would probably be worked out at the
6 time of sealing, yes.

7

8 MR. GUNDERSON: Well, we're only talking about a couple
9 of animals. Each one of those communities that did qualify for
10 subsistence bears hunts, they were just a couple of communities
11 and it was just a couple of animals involved. It seems like if
12 you have the regulation in place that controls how these animals
13 are taken, who takes them, it seems like that in itself would
14 take care of it so that it wouldn't -- encumber, keeping any part
15 of the animal or whatever or you can go by the same regs that the
16 guides got to go through. Because why deprive them of the
17 tanning processes that have been used to do this, you know, to
18 get those things cured and then they'll last a lot longer than if
19 you were to do them by the old traditional methods.

20

21 MR. CRATTY: What I can't understand is, you know, if the
22 tanning method's there let them do it. I mean why do they have
23 to do it the old way? If they're using the meat the way they're
24 supposed to, what's the difference what they do with the hide
25 just as long as they ain't selling it, it's being used in the
26 tribal or whatever.

27

28 MR. STOVALL: Uh-huh.

29

30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: It doesn't make much sense to me. I
31 just see nothing but opening for prosecution of unnecessary
32 reasoning. I know that if we were to utilize a bear skin in our
33 tribal unit that we would wish the bear to be whole and not parts
34 of.

35

36 Do we have anymore comments here on this proposal? Yes,
37 sir.

38

39 MR. JACOBSEN: Yes, I'm Dick Jacobsen from Sand Point
40 with the Aleutian East Borough. And from what I can see out of
41 this, if this was to pass, it would make criminals out of quite
42 a few Native people because there's a lot of different functions
43 that they attend through the state and if they had to use any of
44 the bear or parts of it for dances, robes, what have you, if they
45 took it out of your unit that would make them a criminal.
46 Because if it was whole in the unit and they took it, say to
47 Anchorage for AFN for some reason, traditional dance or whatever,
48 they would have to take the skin off the skull or the skull and
49 skin and claws off the front end of it.

50

00015

1 So even say if you were in that unit and you had it
2 tanned in the traditional manner and you got sick and you had to
3 move to a place where you had more medical service available to
4 you such as Anchorage, and you took your personal possessions
5 with you, such as the bear skin, that would make you a criminal
6 unless you took that skin for the skull off and the claws off the
7 front end. So I think this is a bad proposal and I'd encourage
8 you not to pass it.

9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Dick. Is there anymore
11 comment or discussion on this proposal?

12
13 MR. STOVALL: I want to comment on your comment there.
14 If it's already been sealed, transporting it around as it is,
15 already been tanned and/or sealed, would not be an illegal thing
16 to do from what I understand. This is -- for one thing this
17 would only be in effect for bears that are taken after it's been
18 passed and approved. So the animals that already have had the --
19 have already been, first of all, legally sealed and secondly
20 legally tanned and sealed, there wouldn't be a -- you wouldn't be
21 criminalized for moving it in and out of the area because of the
22 mere fact that it's already within the system.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: But to -- as I am aware of, upon taking
25 of the bear, before anything else happens, it must be sealed,
26 isn't that correct?

27
28 MR. STOVALL: Right.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Isn't that the tools that we utilize to
31 discourage that kind of activity?

32
33 MR. STOVALL: That's the primary tool that's being --
34 that's been used.

35
36 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Please, Robert.

37
38 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, Robert Willis. The sealing is
39 for management purposes. It's got nothing to do with avoiding
40 someone misusing regulation to take a trophy bear and claim it
41 under the subsistence regulation. The purpose of the sealing, as
42 you well know, this population is hunted very heavily, it's
43 managed very closely and we wanted to be sure that we had the
44 scientific data from the bears that were taken for subsistence
45 purposes. The sealing really has nothing to do with destroying
46 the trophy value if you're going to take it outside the unit.
47 Those are two entirely separate actions.

48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I also see this as, number one I do
50 appreciate the concern here, but I think the concern is being

00016

1 whittled down to a few. How many bear are taken off Kodiak, over
2 300 annually? What -- by commercial trophy hunting. And we're
3 talking of a handful here, maybe. I don't quite see the
4 legitimacy, although I do appreciate the concern.
5

6 MR. WILLIS: Well, our concern of a biological standpoint
7 is merely to get the animals sealed. I'll let the Refuge defend
8 their proposal to destroy the trophy value if it is taken outside
9 the unit. My concern as a biologist is just to make sure they're
10 sealed so that we know the age of the bear taken and such.
11

12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: True. We understand that and we have
13 unanimously accepted that side of it. But to already point a
14 finger at criminals before anything like this has even had a
15 chance to happen, which I don't anticipate it and number two, a
16 trophy bear is a trophy bear when it's one of the largest ones
17 whether you want to admit it or not. I mean it just depends on
18 the animal that is taken. I mean if it -- if it's certainly a
19 small bear, it doesn't consider -- it's not considered a trophy
20 then, is it? I don't know what determines the status of trophy.
21

22
23 MR. STOVALL: I'm not a trophy hunter.....
24

25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Me neither.
26

27 MR. STOVALL:so I'm not going to be able to give
28 you any kind of guidelines of what is considered a trophy hunt or
29 not or what's a trophy for that matter. I'm a subsistence
30 biologist, and my primary concern is for bears that are taken are
31 consumed in the village. I understand that there's a lot of uses
32 of all the body parts of bears. And one of those uses being a
33 trophy is if done in the village is -- I guess from this proposal
34 would be a way of ensuring that it's not sold or used for other
35 purposes besides for what it would be used in each individual
36 village.
37

38 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, we have subsistence here now, we
39 have trophy and we have DLP. Where does DLP fit into this then
40 as we know that's a major concern with our villages, and a lot of
41 times these can be utilized other -- as subsistence when it is
42 DLP taken, you know. I'm looking at how is this going to effect
43 the other sides of the taking?
44

45 MR. STOVALL: I'm not sure that I can answer that
46 question. The DLP regulations are primarily State regulations of
47 which the Refuge, of course, abides by. And as I understand it,
48 DLP, the skin -- the whole skin and skull is retained by ADF&G.
49 And what you do with the meat is, of course, that's primarily up
50 to the taker and the ADF&G representatives have come to collect

00017

1 the skin and the skull. And of course, you know, distributing
2 that meat around would be a way to do -- to use that DLP taken
3 bear.

4
5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Doesn't the State return to whoever
6 requests a DLP there at the community center or community hall or
7 school or whatever? But won't the State give that there back to
8 that community?

9
10 MS. ANDREWS: I'm not your local enforcement officer.
11 I'm checking the regulation now. But I don't.....

12
13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I know that that happened before in Port
14 Lions where a bear was shot right in the community and it was
15 requested back to the school and they tanned it and returned it
16 back to the school. That's one way of getting it back whole, I
17 guess, just say it's a DLP bear or whatever; I don't know.

18
19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I don't know, they might just.....

20
21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That was at the cost of the State, not
22 the community.

23
24 MR. STOVALL: I won't address that.

25
26 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask Robert,
27 if he has any information regarding the subsistence hunt of brown
28 bear in the last year and what has -- what have those hunters
29 done with those bear skins and stuff? Because when I read the
30 regulation, to me, I think, it's implying that that's what the
31 hunters are going to do with the claws and hides, that they're
32 going to take those out of the region?

33
34 MR. STOVALL: Well, I guess that's part of my agency
35 report, but I can say what it was now. The subsistence hunt in
36 Kodiak had a full regulatory year now. Out of the 11 possible
37 bears that were harvested, five total were harvested. Three for
38 the Larsen Bay community and two for the Old Harbor community.
39 The Akhiok -- one Akhiok hunter did attempt to take and Port
40 Lions also received one permit but it wasn't used.....

41
42 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Probably a non-Native.

43
44 MR. STOVALL: Right -- by a resident of the village. And
45 we did have a problem with one of the bears taken in Larsen Bay
46 due to the location where it was taken at. It wasn't taken on
47 Federal properties. And that violation was observed by Fish and
48 Wildlife protection officers. So the Refuge didn't do any
49 prosecuting at all. And I'm not sure what the status of the --
50 that particular violation was with State Fish and Wildlife

00018

1 protection. A lot of other details that I'm not sure of so I'm
2 not going to go into them. But this proposal stems from how the
3 original proposal was written up. And because of the mere fact
4 that it wasn't followed through in the regular process, the
5 refuge decided to go ahead and try and put the proposal in front
6 of the Federal Subsistence Board to make a determination as to
7 whether this is a reasonable thing to do.

8

9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess one of the of the things that I
10 look at here, especially with what has transpired in Kodiak this
11 past year, number 1, who can give us a report on the population
12 of bears -- population status of the bear on Kodiak as I believe
13 it's still on the incline. I know that this year in Kodiak
14 because of problem bears at our dump site they put an electrical
15 fence up which, in fact, just moved the bears farther into our
16 community and made them a bigger threat to the human habitat of
17 our community which brang a lot of concern through Kodiak. These
18 things are all relative, I believe, to our situation, whether the
19 dump is on State ground and the bears come off Federal grounds,
20 however that works or however they want to address it, it still
21 is a problem.

22

23 So is there anybody that can give us a report here on
24 what the population and status of the bear on Kodiak is?

25

26 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, before that happens, this
27 proposal is brought to us by the Refuge of Kodiak?

28

29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes.

30

31 MR. TUTIAKOFF: In order for this to continue to go to
32 the next process it'd be our task to vote it up or down or
33 support it or non-support it or what? What's happening here now
34 on this?

35

36 MR. STOVALL: This is just the initial stage of the
37 process. The Refuge has submitted the proposal. I think at the
38 next meeting.....

39

40 MR. TUTIAKOFF: The next meeting?

41

42 MR. STOVALL:at the next meeting of the Regional
43 Advisory Council here you'll have an opportunity to make any
44 changes or recommendations on the proposals and support or not
45 support it. And then it goes through the regular process.

46

47 MR. WILLIS: This proposal will be published in the
48 proposal booklet along with all the other proposals that come in
49 between now and the first week of November when the proposal
50 window closes. And the Council then will get an evaluation of it

00019

1 from the Staff and vote on it at the winter meeting. I would
2 assume the Refuge will have the opportunity to make any
3 modifications also based on conversations with the Council
4 between now and when we close the window and publish the book of
5 proposals.

6
7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I believe, is it not, we are -- as what
8 I'm trying to do is find information to support a decision,
9 although maybe this decision might not be made until a later
10 date, I would at least at this time, I think it would be
11 beneficial for all parties interested to find out where we stand
12 on the issue.

13
14 MR. STOVALL: Mark, I plan on having -- during my agency
15 report, I will discuss the present bear status on Kodiak Island.
16 It is in the handout that you folks have. And how those numbers
17 are derived, the surveys that are being done; things of that
18 nature. I do have that information.

19
20 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Mr. Chair, in regards to the main issue
21 at the time of sealing, the Refuge will remove and retain the
22 skin of the skull and the front claws of the bear, could there be
23 possible wording to say that these items will be turned over to
24 the village councils of that individual, whoever's taking the
25 bear? So that, you know, once the skin does return as a tanned
26 and completed item back to that individual or community, that
27 they have assurance that they're going to get it back. I think
28 there's maybe a little misunderstanding or maybe mistrust in
29 regards to how and why this is being done. It's singling out a
30 small group of users. And it seems like as we go into this
31 process, we seem to be losing more and more cultural values and
32 traditional use of the skins. And by removing it, the claws from
33 the front paws and taking the skin of the skull -- you're not
34 taking the skull, right, you're just taking the skin? I mean,
35 you know, the -- I don't know what the purpose is other than to -
36 - now, I understand what you're saying, if you're trying to stop
37 a trophy hunt utilizing subsistence hunt.

38
39 MR. STOVALL: Uh-huh.

40
41 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I think what needs to be said here is you
42 don't trust us, you know, either you do or you don't. You put us
43 in this position to make these decisions for advisory and
44 subsistence councils, yet you turn around and say, well, we don't
45 trust you, we're going to keep a portion of it until we are sure
46 that you're using it for subsistence or cultural use. And I'm
47 opposed to that kind of thought. And I think that maybe if that
48 decision doesn't have to be made now, that the communities of
49 Kodiak that are effected by this use here ought to be talking to
50 and maybe getting a better way to regulate whether it's

00020

1 commercial or not. I think if we have the time and we don't have
2 to make the decision right now, you've got, what two months, to
3 come up with better wording?

4
5 MR. STOVALL: Uh-huh.
6

7 MR. TUTIAKOFF: And I would support that rather than sit
8 here and debate which is an underlying feeling of everybody here
9 that, you know, we're feeling like we're being mistrusted here.
10 And maybe not the intent of the Refuge, but that's how it's
11 coming across.
12

13 MR. GUNDERSON: This is an ongoing thing and at one point
14 are going to have more hides than they know what to do with as
15 the subsistence hunt goes along. There should be some provision
16 in this proposal where that village group or individual or dance
17 group or whatever it is can trade or whatever to other groups
18 within the state or whatever to -- and use those monies to
19 improve their culture centers or whatever they want to do with
20 it. Because, you know, there's just -- you know, you're only
21 going to be able to use so many hides. Someday they're going to
22 end up with a surplus and they got to have some way to utilize
23 those also.
24

25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Like I said, I do believe the intent of
26 this but I can't support it the way it is at this time. I
27 certainly feel the way these others do. If it's for customary
28 and traditional use it still has a value, whether it's a dollar
29 value or a customary and traditional value. We are talking two
30 different things. I don't believe if the hide is sent out to be
31 tanned and we bring it back home, then you give us back the
32 claws, that we have to sew them back on, that doesn't make any
33 sense to me. This has not had a chance yet to really get out and
34 be utilized to see how it's going to go. I think before we put
35 anymore restraints on it that we must see how we're progressing
36 with what we have.
37

38 What's the wish of the Council at this time to vote?
39

40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, aren't we here just to accept
41 proposals, I mean today?
42

43 MR. TUTIAKOFF: This is going to be published right, with
44 or without or consent?
45

46 MR. WILLIS: That's correct. The proposal, assuming it
47 is not withdrawn by the Refuge between now and the proposal book
48 goes out, it will go out with all the other proposals that have
49 come in this year. And the idea presenting it here is since the
50 Refuge got it in early there was an opportunity to present it to

00021

1 the Council and get some feedback which was certainly done. I
2 think that's all the Council would be expected to do at this time
3 is to give an initial reaction to the proposal.

4
5 MR. LUKIN: I feel we should have a chance to vote on it.
6

7 MR. CRATTY: Just to let you know how funny it is, we got
8 a bear hide hanging on our tribal wall without no claws or head
9 and it just don't seem real for traditional use or culture. That
10 was one of the first ones.

11
12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I believe is what I'd like to see is at
13 least the Council, at least show whether this is a proposal we
14 can work with or whether it is not.

15
16 MR. TUTIAKOFF: I guess I asked that question earlier,
17 Mr. Chair, was to say, we have some period of time in which we
18 can reword this to make it more user friendly?

19
20 MR. STOVALL: Basically I'm here to find out what your
21 thoughts and comments are and I'm very glad that I had an
22 opportunity to be here to do that so I can try and relate those
23 to the Refuge manager and our staff and let them know what the
24 feelings and comments are. Modification is something that can
25 be done at your next meeting, of course. And I think -- I'm
26 pretty sure that the refuge would be welcome to any modifications
27 of this so that -- Council member Vincent was saying, so it's a
28 little bit more user friendly.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess at this time, is what I'm trying
31 to do is stay away from assuming anything. I believe at this
32 time is what I'd basically like to do is ask the Council, each
33 member, to at least let us know whether they support it or not.
34 I believe that would be fair, that's not a vote, it's just
35 feedback, if you will.

36
37 Can we go ahead and do that -- Paul.

38
39 MR. GUNDERSON: Pardon? The way it's been brought
40 forward here today, no, I couldn't accept it.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Ivan.

43
44 MR. LUKIN: Absolutely not. I feel we got enough laws,
45 rules and regulations on what little we get today. I mean we're
46 fighting for what -- what we want to hang on and then you guys
47 keep coming and adding more of this and that and it's just
48 complicating everything. You know, I mean what's the use.
49 You're discouraging us to do what the original intent was here.
50 So I would totally disagree with what you're trying to do here.

00022

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Vince.

2

3 MR. TUTIAKOFF: You heard my comments, Mr. Chair. I
4 don't really support the wording of it because it's not user
5 friendly or does not allow any leeway. And was mentioned by one
6 of our guests, could cause a problem in the court system for an
7 individual to do a subsistence hunt. Although you do say that
8 it's only a tagging purpose, you do not allow them to take it out
9 of Unit 8 to do what's necessary to be done with it.

10

11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Like I have mentioned, I do support the
12 intent of this but I do not support the language as is.

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I feel the same way. I don't -- I
15 really don't support having to cut the claws and the skin off to
16 send it out to have it tanned. I see no problem with as long as
17 it's sealed, there shouldn't be a problem with it.

18

19 MR. CRATTY: That's the same way I feel.

20

21 MR. FOSTER: I feel the same way, too. One -- you
22 haven't -- this hasn't been sent in yet, Vince had a real good
23 idea. Why can't you get together with the effective communities
24 before you send it in and try and redo the wording? Have you had
25 any meetings with any of these communities at all to see -- you
26 guys haven't heard anything on this?

27

28 MR. TUTIAKOFF: This is a new proposal.

29

30 MR. FOSTER: I mean if you could sit down with some of
31 the communities or some of the guys here and go over the wording
32 and then put the proposal in, then maybe it would pass a lot
33 easier.

34

35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'm just saying, you know, I think the
36 hardest part I have with, at least, as far as having these items
37 cut off before it's even able to reach the tannery, I think
38 sealing of it, identifies and catalogs this skin. I certainly
39 can see merit to it once it's back in possession and it's been
40 tanned, certainly customarily and traditionally done -- who says
41 it was even done right here in Kodiak. This leaves a little bit
42 a leeway. So I'm just saying at this point, that's my biggest
43 problem, to have these cut off before the skin is even ready for
44 any misuse.

45

46 MR. STOVALL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. What I'll do is I'll
47 bring back your comments. November 1st is the cut off date
48 for.....

49

50 MR. WILLIS: Early November, Robert. I can't remember the

00023

1 exact date. It's typically the first week in November.

2

3 MR. STOVALL: Okay. Probably -- we'll probably be
4 contacting most of the Kodiak members about this proposal between
5 now and then.

6

7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I just don't see it as being consistent
8 with any other types of use. Is there any more that we'd like to
9 discuss on Proposal 1 here? Hearing none we'd like to move on to
10 Proposal number 2 by the National Wildlife Refuge. Please, sir.

11

12 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Mr. Chairman, before we move on I have to
13 attend another meeting that was already scheduled prior to this
14 meeting. My alternate, Mr. Sweatzoff will be back here shortly
15 to sit in for me. And I'll be back probably within half an hour,
16 45 minutes. Just go over and make an appearance and come back
17 over here if that's okay.

18

19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I have no objection.

20

21 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Thank you.

22

23 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Vince.

24

25 MR. STOVALL: Do you want me to read the second proposal?

26

27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I believe that would be a good way to
28 start.

29

30 MR. STOVALL: Underneath special provisions this proposal
31 would state that non-residents may not accompany Federal
32 subsistence registration permit hunters into the field. Only
33 Alaska residents and/or blood relatives may be in the field with
34 permit holders.

35

36 This is to assure that -- once again, the wording is to
37 assure that non-residents of Alaska are utilizing the registered
38 guides and not village tribal councils for their hunts. That's
39 probably as simple a way as I can put it.

40

41 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: As I see it, I don't have a problem with
42 this. That it is consistent with our other commissions such as
43 sea otter, whaling and things of this nature. At this moment I
44 don't have a problem with it. Council? Al?

45

46 MR. CRATTY: Yeah. I'd like to say the only probably I
47 see if you were to have a tribe come from out of state that
48 wanted to watch or something or, you know, that's the only thing
49 I could see a problem with.

50

00024

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't see a problem with it.

2

3 MR. LUKIN: I guess I'd kind of agree with Al a little
4 bit. If you've got members that aren't living in this state, you
5 know, that is the only thing I could see that would affect people
6 that are part of the tribe.

7

8 MR. GUNDERSON: Most through the Native enrollment and
9 everybody, everybody that's enrolled in tribes, even the people
10 living out of state, I think it should be addressed that way in
11 the proposal. That if they are card holding tribal member or
12 whatever they could participate in it or something. It wouldn't
13 knock out the residency requirement on that part. But I do agree
14 with what you're trying to get across here, that were won't be no
15 conflict between the village users and the commercial guides.

16

17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: If accepted would there be any special
18 requests on these natures that on issue by issue they might be
19 able to be performed, which I agree that there is a lot of tribal
20 members that aren't even in this state, but this would be
21 disallowed. Not saying that anybody would, but should a chance
22 come for any reason. And I am also very aware that we are in
23 these past years have really been reaching out to other tribes
24 nation-wide and sharing information, bases, and things of this
25 nature. Other than that I find it consistent with other takings
26 of other animals.

27

28 MR. STOVALL: Blood relatives and other Alaska residents.
29 Blood relatives, of course, could be those who aren't living in
30 the villages or for that matter in Alaska. You have blood
31 relatives in your village and you're accompanying them under
32 hunt. That's -- this provision allows that to happen. I'm not
33 sure how it would address -- of course, the permittee holders
34 would only be residents of each village. The actual person with
35 the permit would be a resident. The tribal members from the
36 Lower 48 come to see this probably would not be in violation of
37 this. The way it's worded now it probably would be, but.....

38

39 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chairman, I have a question for you,
40 Robert. Are these proposals coming about because of the way it
41 reads now that residents at a community whether they're Native or
42 non-Native such as the Port Lyons case where a non-Native got a
43 permit and his relatives could come up and hunt with him. Is
44 that why this has come about or some of it or.....

45

46 MR. STOVALL: No. No. It's come about to assure that
47 there's no intermingling of bear hunts with the registered guides
48 and the subsistence tribal hunters.

49

50 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, my question is because we have

00025

1 non-Native residents living in our communities that can get these
2 permits also, no just the native tribal people.

3
4 MR. STOVALL: Right. That would have no bearing on this
5 particular proposal.....

6
7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, to me bringing somebody from the
8 outside in, that would be my.....

9
10 MR. STOVALL: Yeah. These permits are for -- or issued
11 or given to folks who the village has deemed as designated as
12 their hunter for bears. And it doesn't state anywhere whether
13 that person is Native or non-Native. It's just a rural
14 preference.

15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Case that I think here, my oldest son is
17 non-resident attending the University out of Alabama. Case in
18 scenario, number one, he is a non-resident,....

19
20 MR. STOVALL: Uh-huh.

21
22 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: but he is still my son, a blood
23 relative. How would that be accepted, which side of this
24 proposal would be accepted or not accepted whereas he is -- first
25 of all, it says non-residents may not accompany. But on the same
26 side it says Alaskan residents or blood relatives. So, you see,
27 there's a direct -- I feel, direct conflict of wording, if you
28 will.

29
30 MR. STOVALL: It doesn't say that the blood relative has
31 to be an Alaskan resident. So I would read this as saying only
32 Alaska residents and/or blood relatives. That includes blood
33 relatives who aren't living in the state.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: But I don't want to get caught in a
36 Catch-22 because it says non-residents right off the bat. I
37 mean, you see, we could leave this to attorneys but I don't want
38 it to get that far.

39
40 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, I think your point is well taken.
41 A simple word change there to say non-residents other than blood
42 relatives, something of that nature would probably take care of
43 that. I haven't had a chance to discuss this proposal with the
44 Refuge either and I would strongly recommend that they consult
45 the Solicitor's Office about the legalities of stating who can
46 and who cannot accompany someone in the field before they go much
47 further forward with this proposal.

48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. And that was the only
50 intent?

00026

1 MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman?

2
3 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, Rachel.

4
5 MS. MASON: Since you're talking about the wording of
6 these proposals I just wanted to comment on the wording of blood
7 relatives. That that doesn't account for adoption or
8 stepchildren or other forms of relationship for people that are
9 considered in the family.

10
11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, that was another side. And thank
12 you, Rachel because I am in that position as well. I do have an
13 adopted, legally adopted son but is not a bloodline relative, but
14 he is a resident. So, you see, just in this one family I might
15 find myself in the attorney's office. Is there any more comments
16 here from the Council or anybody in the public wish to comment?

17
18 MR. CRATTY: I'd just like to state, have something
19 written in there where the tribals are starting, you know, like
20 in the Lower 48 are starting to share their differences so we
21 could have something written in there, you know, if it was to be
22 a ceremonial thing or different tribes or something.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes. I see we have Mr. Thomas here with
25 us. I'd like to hear from you.

26
27 MR. THOMAS: Do I qualify as public?

28
29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, Southeast is public, I guess.
30 Good to see you here.

31
32 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure to
33 be here. I was up here for the AFN and your meeting was made
34 known to me that you've having it here and I was invited to stop
35 by and I was honored to have that invitation. And I hear much of
36 what your council -- again, pick up some pointers to see how to
37 get things done the proper way because it's sounding good.

38
39 Mr. Chairman, if I may, I got a copy of the proposal and
40 just to make sure I'm in the right area, are you talking about
41 special provisions in Unit 8?

42
43 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: On the brown bear, yes.

44
45 MR. THOMAS: What was the intent -- I wasn't here for
46 that. What's the intent of the new language? It says non-
47 residents may not accompany Federal subsistence registration
48 permit hunters into the field. Only Alaska residents or blood
49 relatives may be in the field with the permit holders. Is there
50 objection to that or is there problems with that? The reason I

00027

1 say is we had problems seeing that, that talks about rural
2 residents, Native and non-Native. And in order to be a resident
3 you have to be either physically residing there or a student away
4 from home or a person in the military or something of that
5 nature, that takes them away to when they're through with
6 whatever they're doing are coming back. A person that moves
7 away because of a job wouldn't qualify as a resident any longer
8 because he would change his residence to wherever his job is.
9 And I wonder if you considered that.

10
11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's basically what we are discussing
12 at this time, Bill. I just bring the issue of up of my oldest
13 son is away at college and I also have another adopted son which
14 is not a bloodline but a legal adoption. Is there parts of the
15 language which we agree on the intent, but not the language.

16
17 MR. THOMAS: Do they qualify for a permanent fund?

18
19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: One does, one doesn't.

20
21 MR. THOMAS: Oh, I see. I was going to say the permanent
22 fund requirement is a pretty good landmark for deciding whether
23 they're a resident or non-resident.

24
25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: If you get a permanent fund you can
26 afford to go.

27
28 MR. THOMAS: No, no,.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Oh.

31
32 MR. THOMAS:no, no, no, no. I wouldn't be able to
33 afford to go. I know some of the guides out there. And the
34 permanent fund might get you a place in camp, but other than that
35 you'd have to stay in a cabin.

36
37 But anyway, it looks like good language. I don't see
38 anything that there that needs to really be interpreted. It says
39 non-residents may not accompany Federal subsistence registration
40 permit hunters into the field. Only Alaskan or blood relatives
41 may be in the field with permit holders. Alaskan residents
42 and/or blood relatives may be in the field. Even that and/or is
43 really flexible. And that really opens up a lot. Your language
44 provisions like that could start out as a millimeter and wind up
45 being a mile. And you'll be able to change it if you ever get to
46 that point because by that time you're offending a lot of people.
47 But I'm not trying to separate your family from one being
48 eligible and one not being eligible, but at the same time if this
49 happened in lot of cases in your district or your management unit
50 you might find it may be more cumbersome than you want it to be.

00028

1 And you might not -- and you must find yourself that people that
2 are out hunting aren't hunting with the actual reflection of it
3 being a subsistence hunt. So those are just some of the things
4 I would watch out for if I were you.

5
6 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Your wisdom is very much appreciated.
7 But when I look at this proposal here I look at the cost of an
8 attorney on is one side going to say my son is not a resident,
9 therefore, that's what I'm being prosecuted on, but I'm defending
10 myself by saying, but he's my blood relative. So we kind of got
11 both ends of the spectrum.

12
13 MR. THOMAS: Well, I wouldn't sue anybody right now. I
14 think
15 you have got some real good research people here on your staff.
16 I think the members of your council have good, sound sensible
17 minds. They've lived there. They know the resource. They know
18 the nature of the community, the people that use the resource and
19 all this kind of thing. And everything I've heard has been tied
20 to my discussions so far. And I've learned a lot just in the
21 couple of minutes I've been here.

22
23 Just for your information on the Kodiak Council, I used
24 to work for the Coast Guard and a lot of my work was in Kodiak,
25 so I spent time in Kodiak and some of the other places where the
26 Coast Guard hang out. I won't discuss any of those places but
27 I'll tell you about the work places, so -- but I appreciate the
28 opportunity. And I won't ask to come up here, but thank you
29 again for allowing me to say something.

30
31 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Bill. For those of you who
32 don't know Bill, he's the chairman of the Southeast Subsistence
33 Council.

34
35 Is any more discussion on this proposal? I guess we can
36 run with what we have on this then, Robert. You see that we do
37 support the intent. Here again, maybe some minor modifications
38 of language.

39
40 MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, could I say something?

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure.

43
44 MR. FOSTER: I don't see any problem with this. I was
45 just wondering could there be some sort of a program for
46 exceptions. Let's say you guys want to bring up somebody, a
47 tribe from down in the Lower 48 and they came to, you know, to
48 talk to you. Could there be something like that where.....

49
50 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That was my question. Would something

00029

1 like this fall under special action. I don't know how the
2 process would handle it. Maybe Ida can.....

3
4 MR. STOVALL: I'm not sure if I'm the one who can answer
5 this question. I think from the Refuge standpoint it's we're
6 just looking out to make sure that the resource is being properly
7 harvested from a subsistence standpoint. And I don't think we
8 have any objection with whatever, if the villages wanted to have
9 someone accompany the people in the field as long as those
10 persons aren't the ones who are actually going to receive the
11 permits. There should be no objection to that.

12
13 MR. FOSTER: Just so there's something in place where
14 somebody can come to you and, you know, for exceptions, come and
15 talk to you and ask you beforehand.

16
17 MR. STOVALL: The Refuge isn't going to be that
18 inflexible.
19 Not at all.

20
21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: A definite maybe then. Yes, Ida, excuse
22 me.

23
24 MR. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, staff committee member
25 for BIA. I have concern over two things. One is blood relative.
26 That hasn't been defined. It isn't defined in this and, perhaps,
27 will be addressed in the staff analysis before your next meeting.

28
29
30 I believe in the past there was some discussion with the
31 Solicitor's Office on that topic and said that would be a problem
32 area. And the other concern is something stated by Mr. Thomas,
33 what is the intent of this proposal? Is it not your proposal.
34 It's proposed by the Refuge. And I think that needs to be
35 answered to your satisfaction. And as in the previous proposal
36 your comments were requesting additional clarification and
37 consultation with the users. And I think that also should be
38 considered in this instance. And if there were exceptions as Mr.
39 Foster requested, those kinds of comments should be addressed if
40 not in the staff analysis at your next meeting, that if they
41 aren't addressed in the staff analysis that you request what were
42 the provisions and to try by all means to avoid special actions,
43 which the Board is trying to avoid. And Mr. Foster's concern is
44 a valid concern. To have somebody say yes, we won't charge you
45 verbally and then to have you cited out in the field is another
46 thing. So I would urge you to have these statements in writing.

47
48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Ida. And that's what really
50 concerns me is we have looked at the whole issue of subsistence

00030

1 and where it is today, and yet we wake up this morning with
2 another thump.

3
4 (Off record)
5 (On record)
6

7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. Thank you. We would like to
8 continue on with our agenda as we have it. Right now we are
9 under -- still under agency proposals and to which we will go
10 into old business. We do have a subject that just seems to be
11 meant for this topic. And, Rachel, will you please come present
12 that to us. Thank you.

13
14 MS. MASON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, I have an item
15 that I wanted to bring up before the council that nicely bridges
16 the proposal section with the old business because this is a
17 proposal that came up last year and then it was deferred until
18 this year. So it will come up before the council in the -- at
19 the spring meeting for your action on it.

20
21 This was Proposal 43 last year and it was submitted by
22 the council and it requested a c&t for brown bear in Unit 9(D)
23 and 10, Unimak Island. And when the council considered it,
24 members of the council brought up new information on uses of
25 brown bear in those units. And so I promised to work with those
26 council members and also with other residents of the area to
27 collect that information to have it recorded for the proposal to
28 be brought before you next year. So that's the status of it now
29 and I just wanted to give you a heads up that that would be
30 coming along, along with the other proposals.

31
32 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Are you saying then that the information
33 on the issue is being conducted or is finished or preliminary
34 stages?

35
36 MS. MASON: It's not finished. It's not even begun.
37 It's -- during the course of the proposal analysis time that's
38 when I will be contacting -- actually the people that had brought
39 up information were Paul and Della and Melvin, who was on the
40 council. And so I'll be working with those three people and also
41 asking you for suggestions of other knowledgeable people I could
42 talk to about uses of bear in the area. So it -- that will be
43 happening in the next few months but there hasn't been any survey
44 or anything like that.

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'm just aware that when we first
47 introduced the proposal for a subsistence bear in Kodiak we did
48 have reports that the Aleut people never did use the brown bear.

49
50 MS. MASON: Right.

00031

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So I hope that we come up with a better
2 understanding.

3
4 MS. MASON: We'll hope we can get some good information.

5
6 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. Was that the extent or

7
8 MS. MASON: That's it.

9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: you had something else?

11
12 MS. MASON: That's it.

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's it.

15
16 MS. MASON: I think I'm next though.

17
18 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, that's why I'm kind of shuffling my
19 feet here.

20
21 MS. MASON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to
22 be talking to you about the c&t task force that the -- the work
23 of the task force. And all of you should have received a copy of
24 -- a summary of what the task force has done. This was a task
25 force that was appointed last year at the spring board meeting.
26 Or actually it was appointed during the joint board and tiers
27 meeting. And it was as a result of issues that had brought up by
28 the councils, not only at the board meeting but over the years,
29 that there have been many difficulties in applying c&t
30 determinations.

31 And so the purpose of this group is to review and
32 reevaluate the c&t determination process, just to see if it's
33 working, if there needs to be changes on it. And at this point
34 the group is seeking council input on -- and a recommendation on
35 what you think should be done with c&t. And after -- this is one
36 of the last council meetings in this round so I can also report
37 to you what some of the other councils have done with that. But
38 after all the council meetings the task force will meet again in
39 order to put them together and make a recommendation to the
40 Federal Subsistence Board. And they hope to be able to do that
41 by December 1st.

42
43 There are actually some of the members of the group with
44 us today in the -- here. Bill Thomas is a council member
45 representative of the group. And the other members from the
46 councils are Craig Fleener of the Eastern Interior Council and
47 Dan O'Hara of the Bristol Bay Council. And representing the
48 board we have Mitch Demientieff and Fred Armstrong. Representing
49 the staff committee we have Ida Hildebrand, who's also here now,
50 and Sandy Rabinowitch, Keith Goltz and Ken Thompson. And I would

00032

1 like to emphasize that this group was formed in response to the
2 concerns brought forward by the council chairs reflecting the
3 trouble that the councils have had over the years.

4
5 Just to give you some council-specific examples to show
6 what problems there have been with c&t, I would remind you of the
7 c&t for elk in Kodiak because this was an example of the
8 councils' debates over whether all of the Kodiak communities
9 should be treated as a unit, an inter-related unit, a cultural
10 unit or whether or not the c&t should be restricted to only those
11 communities for which there is a documented history of the use of
12 elk. Another example of c&t that you have considered recently is
13 the caribou c&t in Unit 9(D) and 10, the Unimak Island. There
14 was already a c&t for caribou in 9(D) but Unimak Island was also
15 considered last year. So in both of these examples there's a
16 question of what the use area focus is going to be, whether
17 you're going to be considering a community of users of all the
18 communities in the unit or a cultural group or if you're going to
19 go community by community and look at these.

20
21 And another issue that hasn't come up so much in this
22 region, that I recall, but has been an issue of concern is
23 whether c&t should be for all species or go species by species.
24 And there have been several suggestions that the use area be
25 considered for all species instead of having to do the c&ts every
26 time for one species at a time.

27
28 Okay. One of the questions that the task force talked
29 about is why do we make c&t recommendations at all, what has been
30 the purpose of them. And one of the questions, one of the main
31 questions that this might frame your way of thinking about this
32 is whether c&t determinations, although having the intent of
33 protecting the subsistence users, if they really have the effect
34 of restricting subsistence users. What would happen if there was
35 no c&t as the -- our practices now stand is that all rural
36 residents would be eligible instead. And then in times of
37 shortage, then the criteria that are outlined in Section 804 of
38 ANILCA would kick in. And those criteria are, first of all, that
39 there be customary and direct dependents; second, that the user
40 live in close proximity to the resource; and, three, have few
41 other resources.

42
43 And the potential risks of relying on the 804 criteria
44 come in the interpretation of these criteria. For example, they
45 could be seen as individual criteria rather than a community
46 focus or the reference to direct dependents could be interpreted
47 as emphasizing the nutritional aspects of subsistence use at the
48 expense of the cultural uses. But at this time we still have a
49 c&t determination process that would -- that comes at request
50 rather than being applied in times of shortage. Whereas the 804

00033

1 criteria would be applied only in times of a resource shortage.

2

3 Okay. The c&t task force, I wrote on the board there
4 some of the options that were developed and which we were asked
5 to bring before each of the councils at this point. And here are
6 the options. Of course you would not be limited to these but
7 these are ones just to frame your discussion. The first option
8 that's written up there is the eight-factor approach. And that's
9 the status quo. That's what's used now. And independently of
10 the eight factors are some other aspects of c&t. For example,
11 whether it goes species by species or all species at once.
12 Whether it goes by community or unit or what the focus is of the
13 discussion. But the eight factors are a part of all of our c&t
14 analyses at this point.

15

16 The modified-factors approach is one that would continue
17 to use factors such as the eight ones but either shorten them,
18 reduce it down to five or four or some limited factor. But there
19 would be an effort to retain the cultural context, which is the
20 purpose of the eight factors.

21

22 The council recommendation approach, this could -- under
23 this approach the council would set the criteria for c&t. So it
24 could incorporate elements of these other options too or the
25 council could develop its own criteria for c&t.

26

27 The units and surrounding units approach, this came out
28 of the eastern interior region, or this was suggested by them.
29 And under this there would be a presumed c&t for the unit of
30 residency and all the surrounding units.

31

32 And then the final one would be no c&t. So within these
33 options you have the range of the status quo to no c&t. And
34 there could be other options that you might develop or
35 modification of the ones that are presented here and possibly a
36 variety of options would work for you mixing and matching the
37 different ones. Some of the councils have asked what would
38 happen if -- some of the councils have one approach. Some of the
39 councils have another. And I don't know the answer to that, what
40 the board would think of it, one region having one approach to
41 c&t and one having another. I do know that there would be some
42 practical problems in applying it, especially in those cases
43 where there's an overlap between two regions.

44

45 At the southeast meeting the question was brought up what
46 if some of the meetings decided to get rid of c&t and some of
47 them didn't, would that be possible too. I don't know the
48 board's response to that but I would caution you that there would
49 be some obvious practical problems to it. Should I -- are you
50 interested in knowing about what the other councils recommended

00034

1 in this or do you want me to stop at this point?

2

3 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Just for purposes here, just wondering
4 if there might be some other discussion on what you have already
5 spoken so we don't get too far behind of what page we're on.

6

7 MS. MASON: Okay.

8

9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So I would like at this time to see if
10 anybody has any questions to address as to what Rachel has just
11 spoke on. I know I do, Rachel.

12

13 MS. MASON: Uh-huh. (Affirmative)

14

15 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: As we look at it under c&t and we talk
16 of times of shortage, I don't know where shortage is defined.
17 That is a real problem with me. As we have experienced in the
18 past when it came to shortage, it was shortage for everybody. In
19 other words, the seasons were closed. Yet on paper we have a
20 Tier I, Tier II, Tier III, looks good on paper, but to implement
21 it, it has not been done. In other words, we have no guidelines
22 or thresholds to let us know when we are coming near a shortage
23 or what that's going to mean.

24 MS. MASON: Yeah.

25

26 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So I have a real difficult time even
27 discussing shortage when I have not heard the definition of
28 shortage and when this will be implemented.

29

30 MS. MASON: Yeah. Well, that would be a biological
31 decision so I would call on Robert to comment on what the -- how
32 a resource shortage is determined.

33

34 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: As we're well aware, another one is
35 shortage, let's say, on the Yukon. I mean, here they've been
36 shut down twice now and still we have nothing in place to address
37 what happens and what tier goes in at what time. Thank you.

38

39 MR. WILLIS: As you say, Mr. Chair, there's no set
40 definition which covers all cases. What's typically done is to
41 evaluate each population that's being harvested to determine
42 whether or not it's still in a healthy condition. And this is
43 not something that you can put parenthesis around or spell out
44 specifically except in specific management plans. As an example,
45 the southern alaska peninsula caribou herd had certain criteria
46 that had to be met. You'll recall that first the state season
47 for all residents was canceled, I believe, in 1993. Subsistence
48 hunting continued for another year and a half but the herd
49 continued to decline below the threshold where any hunting could
50 be allowed and then the subsistence hunting was also closed. So

00035

1 this is an example of looking at specific herds of animals,
2 specific populations in some areas, and then making a decision
3 based on what's happening to that particular population.

4
5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes. On that same respect, which we are
6 well aware of, the South Peninsula herd, but I was just invited
7 to the meeting on the North Peninsula caribou herd to which we
8 have had absolutely no thresholds or no identification of
9 shortage or what is the field going to -- how many animals will
10 it take. So here again we had absolutely nothing to go on other
11 than the people of the region had come together and said the herd
12 is diminishing. We don't want it to go into the status as to
13 which the South Peninsula caribou herd came to. So it was a very
14 good reaction by the people to try to resolve this before it did
15 become an issue. So that's the kind of point we're caught in.

16
17 MS. MASON: Well, that -- if I could just comment on
18 that, if it was agreed that there was a resource shortage, the
19 Section 804 criteria would serve as a way to identify those users
20 that would be permitted to use the resource if there was -- some
21 people could harvest it but there wasn't enough for everybody
22 around. So those criteria would identify those users that were
23 considered subsistence users. And that, in fact, is what the c&t
24 determination is intended to do but that is a filter that --
25 presently that takes place before a resource shortage happens.
26 And then if there's still not enough to go around, then the 804
27 criteria would kick in and that would separate out those
28 subsistence users from the non-subsistence users.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'm just not comfortable with the term,
31 in time of shortage. That is a very wide span and depending on
32 who you are talking to, whether you're talking to the people of
33 the area or you're talking to the management situation, usually
34 there's a conflict.

35
36 MS. MASON: Right. And we certainly are familiar with
37 that from the situation of the Southern Alaska Peninsula caribou
38 herd that there may be disagreement over how it is defined.

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: The other thing I wanted to address was
41 you asked whether we should go by species or by area. I am well
42 aware of in the past that there was species out there that
43 management never even knew existed in these areas. I mean, we
44 came up against that issue. So, here again, when we look at it
45 I'm looking at why do we go by fish and game or other management
46 units when we are a region of people which were, I feel,
47 adequately defined for the different tribes and user groups. It
48 very much perplexes me when we have to go one against each other
49 when we are all together in the same region but because of
50 different sub-management units it becomes a conflict again with

00036

1 the same people and same user groups.

2 So those are just some of the comments that I have as I
3 will once again relate what has transpired in Kodiak. Let's take
4 for instance the king crab. We have the biggest coast guard base
5 in the United States stationed here in Kodiak, as being in Kodiak
6 they were considered residents to which the coast guard and the
7 previous navy and army and marines supplied these people with
8 equipment, boats, gear, to go out and participate in these
9 takings. And we have limited public lands there right near
10 Kodiak, so they put all the effort right in the vicinity of the
11 coast guard user group. Certainly I don't want to discontinue
12 anybody but in a case like that we have absolutely no control of
13 what the government is going to bring in or take out. So that
14 was a real necessity, I felt, for our people in the Kodiak area
15 to go under c&t for the king crab, which we have discussed in the
16 past. So using that as an example, depending on -- here again,
17 I'm just using that as a example where we have no control and
18 therefore we kind of -- we're forced into some sort of c&t.

19

20 MS. MASON: If I could comment on your comment, Mr.
21 Chairman?

22

23 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure.

24

25 MS. MASON: Okay. Just a couple of things, you mentioned
26 that the units are not the most appropriate dividing lines
27 between the use areas and at this point this would be an
28 opportunity to make recommendations on what would be a better way
29 to define the traditional use area. And, second, with the
30 species by species versus one species at a time, to do it all
31 species within a traditional area would be to recognize that
32 subsistence uses are opportunistic, that somebody that's out
33 hunting for one thing, if they see something else, they're likely
34 to go to the same use areas and get other species other than the
35 one that's -- that has the c&t. So that's

36

37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Bi-catch.

38

39 MS. MASON: Right. Right, yeah, see a deer on the shore
40 or something while you're fishing. So those are just a couple of
41 comments.

42

43 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Does the council have any comments here
44 on the discussion?

45

46 MR. LUKIN: In listening to Rachel, she mentioned
47 changing everything to all c&t once. You mentioned that once and
48 I notice you've got up there -- you made sure you wrote no c&t up
49 there, you know. What I'm looking at is the Native people lived
50 on these resources for many, many years and I mentioned this

00037

1 before, and you can call them whatever you want but I think the
2 key here for us is that we need to -- this needs to be kept
3 priority for us. We need to be put up front and put the big guy
4 -- big game guy later. You see? This is, as far as I'm
5 concerned, priority. It needs to be set and left that way. You
6 can call it c&t or whatever. There has been trade with a number
7 of different species here and -- but for the most part it's being
8 used, utilized in the homes for survival throughout the winter.
9 But I would recommend that we keep it the way it was, the
10 original intent, and stay that way. It needs to be that way. We
11 need to be recognized that we are who we are and we're not going
12 to change because you are coming up with different laws.

13

14 MS. MASON: So you're saying that there has to be some
15 way of identifying subsistence

16

17 MR. LUKIN: I feel that way. I feel we should be set up
18 -- it should be set up to where we -- as the Native people, it's
19 priority that we be able to utilize what's here for us.

20

21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I believe in short we should not have to
22 be defending our existence. Anymore comments or questions here
23 from council or the public? Yes, Ida.

24

25 MS. HILDEBRAND: Ida Hildebrand, staff committee member.
26 Just for your information and discussion purposes, I've attended
27 some of the other regional councils and listened to their
28 discussions on c&t. And part of the discussions is a request
29 that traditional knowledge and oral history be recognized and
30 given greater weight than under the current system. Or that if
31 there are any other factors listed, if you choose to use the
32 eight factors or fewer factors, that traditional knowledge and
33 the oral testimony of people before your council and the council
34 itself be given greater weight. And in what use areas, some
35 councils have favored traditional use areas, that anything in
36 that traditional use area

37 -- if you have for instance, although you have established c&t
38 for caribou within that area, that you would then have c&t for
39 anything edible that flies, swims, walks, crawls, et cetera. And
40 the councils in general favor some form of c&t determination.
41 And others that opposed it say they would keep the determinations
42 already on the book and expand to everything else that's edible
43 in the region. And I'm saying this just for discussion purposes.

44

45 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. And it is unfortunate that
46 we do have to narrow this down to something such as c&t. But as
47 today's society, it's a must I feel. Is there any more
48 discussion as to what we have been discussing at this point? If
49 not, I'll let you carry on.

50

00038

1 MS. MASON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to
2 bring up some of the discussion that came forward at the --
3 especially at the southcentral and southeast meetings because I
4 think it would be of interest to this council. And also Mr.
5 Thomas is here and he might be able to shed some more light on
6 the southeast discussion. But I've also just heard that the
7 northern councils, the North Slope, Northwest Alaska, and Seward
8 Peninsula, that all three of those have gone for the council
9 recommendation approach but they haven't been specific about what
10 the council recommendation would be. But they like the idea of
11 that one.

12
13 In the Southcentral council meeting we heard a lot of
14 discussion and there were a lot of different perspectives
15 presented. It was a good discussion and much of it was colored
16 by the presence there of some of the eastern interior
17 representatives or people from the eastern interior region. And
18 the eastern interior, as I mentioned, they're the ones that
19 brought up the unit and surrounding units approach. But the
20 Southcentral Council members didn't -- they didn't like the idea
21 of all of Unit 13 being included, for example, or all of Unit 11
22 or 12. But they have some real big units in their region that
23 are very diverse. So they didn't like that very much.

24
25 The Chistochina Village Council had brought their own
26 proposal forward asking to get rid of the unit boundaries for the
27 purposes of c&t and instead replace them with watersheds. They
28 said that this was a more accurate depiction of traditional
29 subsistence uses and that the unit boundaries are artificial
30 ones.

31
32 And the Denali Subsistence Resource Council brought up a
33 proposal which the Southcentral council liked very much. And, in
34 fact, they adopted a version of it. But what the Denali SRC
35 wanted to do was to modify the factors and to drop the
36 requirement -- or not the requirement but the factor that states
37 that there must be a wide diversity of resources used. Instead
38 they just wanted to replace that with a statement saying that it
39 was reliance on fish and wildlife resources. They wanted to add
40 language saying that there must be proximity to the resources in
41 addition to it being reasonably accessible. And as Ida
42 mentioned, they added a factor stating that local and traditional
43 knowledge representing the community area should have significant
44 influence in making the c&t decision. So what the Southcentral
45 council recommended was the eight factors plus those amendments.

46
47 In terms of the Southeast regional council's discussion,
48 first of all, they had a two day retreat prior to the council
49 meeting. So there was an opportunity to discuss all these
50 factors or these options and what the c&t approach should be in

00039

1 a more informal setting before the council meeting. But at the
2 retreat they outlined all the advantages of doing c&t versus all
3 the disadvantages of doing c&t. And some of the members brought
4 up their concerns that although c&ts were meant to protect
5 subsistence users they were -- in actual reality they were
6 restricting subsistence users. As I mentioned the Southeast
7 council members were curious about how feasible it would be for
8 the different regional councils to take different approaches to
9 c&t. And one member asked what would happen if some of them
10 decided not to have c&t and others did. And, again, there would
11 be a problem with overlapping proposals between the regions.

12
13 But what the c&t ended up with was they had a discussion
14 in which several people declared their support for a combination
15 of the council recommendation approach with the unit and
16 surrounding units approach. And what -- the motion that they
17 finally supported was one that said c&t determinations shall be
18 made on a community basis at the unit level for all species
19 unless otherwise determined by the regional advisory council as
20 based on Title VIII of ANILCA. So they supported a continuation
21 of the c&t process. They wanted the c&ts to be done for each
22 community on a community by community basis. But then the use
23 area would be at the unit level. And they wanted all species
24 considered together rather than one species at a time.

25
26 And the other information that I have on the other
27 councils that have met was that the Yukon/Kuskokwim Council voted
28 to keep the eight factors as status quo whereas the Western
29 Interior council supported the Denali SRC's recommendation which
30 added a factor, adding local and traditional knowledge to -- and
31 then maybe other changes that I mentioned that Southcentral
32 recommended. So that's what I know about the other councils and
33 I'll answer what questions I can.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I think traditional knowledge to me is
36 a gimme. We wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for traditional
37 knowledge passed on down from generation to generation. So I
38 don't -- for me that's hardly a point for discussion myself. I
39 look at Kodiak and its uniqueness, not only its geographics but
40 the boundaries that are set. I think we are maybe the only one
41 that has only one unit, Unit 8, and it encompasses the complete
42 Kodiak Island.

43
44 MS. MASON: Nine and 10.

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Right. That's within our region.

47
48 MS. MASON: Yeah.

49
50 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Right. But I'm just speaking of unit,

00040

1 by unit within itself. So then are some of the things that I
2 think of and I hope Bill isn't running off.

3

4 MR. THOMAS: I have to. I have another place I have to
5 be right now otherwise I'd be happy to stay.

6

7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. Well, I was just hoping to get a
8 little light on what the task force

9

10 MR. THOMAS: Rachel's doing a very good job.

11

12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thanks, Bill. Well, I guess we'd like
13 to hear from the rest of the council. How is this being
14 digested? I believe hearing nothing doesn't mean we don't
15 believe in c&t or you're satisfied with the way things are
16 progressing? I don't know which way to

17

18 MR. CRATTY: I'm satisfied with it.

19

20 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I am for one very -- kind of excited
21 with the council recommendation approach for the simple fact is
22 it seems like the past four or five years, I don't mean it
23 offensively, but we have been having to educate the board on how,
24 when, where and why these many species have been requested. And
25 we have spent a great deal of our time in these meetings before
26 the board to try and come up with a conclusion by having to teach
27 them why, what, when, how, you know, the process which eats up
28 much of our precious time to which we have lots of other
29 proposals that we are hoping to get passed. So whatever it takes
30 I hope they take these traditional knowledges and rely on them
31 for our future proposals as well, that I don't feel these council
32 recommendations are just pulled out of a hat and out of pure
33 desire. Yes, John.

34

35 MR. FOSTER: You'll have to excuse me, this is my first
36 meeting. You said now -- I heard the question what if different
37 councils have different options. Can they have?

38

39 MS. MASON: Well, I don't know what the board will go
40 with. At this point we're gathering recommendations for all of
41 the councils. And so I think that it's only realistic to think
42 that the councils are going to have different recommendations.

43

44 MR. FOSTER: Yeah, I know for a fact that they're going
45 to have different recommendations. If nothing else, just because
46 of each area is different.

47

48 MS. MASON: Right. And that actually -- that's one of
49 the main things that have brought us to this point now, is the
50 fact that the different regions are finding that they have

00041

1 different issues that come up with c&t. They have to deal with
2 it differently. So there already is a difference in approach
3 between -- among the regions.

4

5 MR. FOSTER: Are you looking for a recommendation from
6 us? Do we need to choose one of these? Is this what we're
7 looking at?

8

9 MS. MASON: No. This is just -- those are just put there
10 for your -- to aid your discussion.

11

12 MR. FOSTER: Okay, yeah. Let me put it a little
13 differently. Do we have to come up with something?

14

15 MS. MASON: The task force hopes that each of the
16 councils will come up with a recommendation. You shouldn't be
17 bound by what the other councils do. And I only gave that to you
18 just to -- for your information. But the next step after this
19 will be that the task force is going to meet again. And they
20 will consider all the options that the councils have come up with
21 and then that group will forward a recommendation to the board.
22 I cannot speak for what the board will do with that or what the
23 task force when they put them together. So, you know, I can't
24 answer what the policy will be but just that that has been
25 brought up and that realistically there probably will be a number
26 of different options brought up.

27

28 MR. FOSTER: Yeah. When would you need this?

29

30 MS. MASON: By December 1st.

31

32 MR. GUNDERSON: A lot of it's got to do too that there's
33 even going to be a difference in the understanding of c&t between
34 communities in one region. I think it would be a good portion of
35 it is, that all of the communities within a given region discuss
36 what they feel the priority should be because some -- several
37 things are probably going to be weeded out just because of sheer
38 numbers for -- because of management controls or whatever or
39 maybe abundance of whatever that critter may be. So it's -- if
40 we can get one region to agree -- the communities in one region
41 to agree on how they're going to approach it, I think it'd make
42 it a lot easier for -- because I know in Kodiak they're a lot
43 different than where they are in Nelson Lagoon, different animals
44 that they're using for -- if this is used not for discussion
45 purposes, you know, they probably have more dried fish and salt
46 salmon around there than they do smoked fish. And Nelson Lagoon
47 would have more smoked fish than we'd have dried or -- and that's
48 just using that for an example. And other things like brown bear
49 for customary and traditional use, a couple of old trappers using
50 bear skins for covers on their bunks, it's about the only thing

00042

1 I can remember that being used for, you know. And that's -- so
2 it really wouldn't be participating too much in that part of it
3 but would listen in on the conversation part of it to find out,
4 you know -- I'm learning a lot about this customary and
5 traditional use by the discussion around this table. There's a
6 lot of things I'm totally unaware of.

7
8 MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, there could be considerable
9 flexibility built into the council recommendation approach to
10 make some exceptions to whatever criteria that you wish to have.
11 And just to respond to what you're saying about there being
12 differences among the communities, that is where the knowledge of
13 the council members really will come into play because you guys
14 know more about the region than anybody else. And so that's
15 where your recommendation on c&t are very important. And just as
16 an example of how some community differences might be built into
17 it, the Eastern Interior and Southcentral councils were
18 discussing at the Southcentral meeting what might be some
19 problems with the unit and surrounding units approach if there
20 were certain communities that they recognized were not
21 subsistence use communities, like a military base or something
22 like that. That -- you wouldn't have to take that lock, stock
23 and barrel, you might say -- unless there is a community that is
24 not a subsistence community or something like that. So I guess
25 my main point is that there could be flexibility built into your
26 approach.

27
28 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess it brings to my mind is you say
29 this -- how do we define community? I mean we have a village; we
30 have a logging camp and we have a fish processing; are all three
31 of those a community? So I don't know quite how to address that.

32
33 MS. MASON: Well, that's one that has not been addressed
34 in the subsistence program and so the council could develop its
35 own definition but it would be a problem.

36
37 MR. CRATTY: Yeah, I'd just like to say working with
38 Rachel, I think we've done a pretty good job here the last few
39 years. And I like this modified factor option and the council
40 recommendation option.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: One other -- since Bill got away from
43 us, Ida, you're part of the task force, is there anything you'd
44 like to share with us on this?

45
46 MS. HILDEBRAND: Perhaps I'm hearing -- some of you are
47 new to the council and I appreciate that you're not familiar with
48 the process. The current process is if you establish customary
49 and traditional use for any species out there, that means that
50 the people of that region have a right to hunt it under

00043

1 subsistence use on federal lands. And to establish c&t,
2 presently the federal system has adopted the eight factors from
3 the state system and then modified it by not requiring every
4 factor be met and use the interpretation or testimony of local
5 users in their deliberations on how to decide whether or not you
6 have the right to hunt. c&t is only about the right to hunt. It
7 isn't about the methods and means or how many is used or that
8 sort of thing.

9
10 c&t is just saying what is the process we will use in
11 order to determine whether or not we have a right to hunt any
12 species. And that's the information that the task group is
13 looking at. What does this region think are the important things
14 you should consider when you're determining whether or not the
15 people of your region have a right to hunt anything that fish,
16 flies, swims, crawls, et cetera. And there is no one right
17 answer. It is whatever you as individuals or a council think are
18 important. And part of the problem in the past in your region
19 has been over the caribou, who's going to hunt the caribou; who
20 has the right to determine who will get the permits and that sort
21 of thing or do we have to keep coming back for every single
22 little animal that's out there? Do we have to fight about
23 whether elk have been introduced or not?

24
25 And because introduced species or reintroduced species --
26 reintroduce is when the species had at one time lived in the area
27 but was extinct for various reasons. If reintroduced, then there
28 would be no written documented -- there may not be any written
29 documented history or use. And so that's when other councils are
30 saying therefore traditional knowledge is more important because
31 some of our eldest know that this species used to exist here.
32 Others are concerned about don't rely only on written data
33 because written data in the state of Alaska only happened since
34 1960 when the state became a state. So they're concerned about
35 a greater emphasis on traditional knowledge. So in your
36 deliberations it's what is working, what are the points of
37 contention, is there a better way, is there a means to improve
38 what's going on. And because of those very same questions to all
39 the regions, some of them just stated if we have c&t for any
40 species, we have c&t for all species.

41
42 So it's your own discussion, your own reflection on what
43 the people in your region have done, are interested in doing and
44 what has been the problem in your own exercise of presenting
45 proposals to the board, what were the points that you felt were
46 weighted against you. And I hope that helps.

47
48 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Absolutely. Any input is a great help,
49 Ida. Does anybody have any questions at this time for Ida?
50 Thank you. Welcome, Gilda. I guess you can figure out what page

00044

1 we're on. How are we doing here? Are we digesting all of this?
2 Is there any more light that can be shed for anybody on where
3 we're at with c&t? None. Thank you, Rachel.

4
5 MS. MASON: Are you going to be making a recommendation
6 or

7
8 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, I believe -- it's my hope that we
9 will throw this around a little bit. Maybe during the lunch hour
10 we can think about it and then when we come back -- I don't want
11 to go ahead and start a new topic here with just minutes before
12 lunch time. So maybe that's what I'd like to do at this time is
13 go ahead and break for lunch and hopefully when we come back we
14 can come to some kind of united front as to how we foresee c&t.
15 So at this time -- what would be fair? Do you want to come right
16 back at 1:00 or 1:30? I'll give you a choice at this moment.
17 One o'clock it is. Thank you.

18
19 (Off record)
20 (On record)

21
22 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess it's time that we call us back
23 to order here. Although I see we're still shy a few people but
24 we need to keep moving on this as we do have other activities
25 going on with council members here later on this afternoon. Time
26 frames must be met at this time. I guess I'd like to pick up
27 where we left off and that was under the c&t options that we had
28 discussed here prior to lunch. So at this time I would like to
29 hear from the council about their wishes of the council as far as
30 the c&t options.

31
32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'm in favor of accepting
33 a council recommendation option.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Council recommendation, certainly I
36 believe that is a good start. I would also go with that. I
37 would also like to see some kind of modification factors along
38 with the council recommendations.

39
40 MR. CRATTY: Mr. Chairman, I agree and I see the modified
41 factor option and the council recommendation option.

42
43 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: How would the council like to handle
44 this, as a general consensus or as a vote?

45
46 MR. GUNDERSON: I think a general consensus ought to do.

47
48 MR. LUKIN: I agree.

49
50 MS. SHELLIKOFF: I agree.

00045

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you.

2

3 MR. GUNDERSON: I feel the same as you do on it.

4

5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. It sounds like the council has
6 chosen the council recommendation along with the modified factor.
7 Is there any more issues dealing with the c&t options?

8

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Mr. Chairman, I had one -- I don't know
10 if it would fall under this or not. On the elk on Kodiak --
11 Afognak, I hunted elk over there this fall and there now is
12 access to that subsistence area by road and the state opens that
13 to registration right after the c&t subsistence hunt. Well, I
14 hear just not long ago there's been at least 16 or 20 elk taken
15 from that area. But the reason for having that registration was
16 -- I understood was because of the access. There was no access
17 to that area. Now there is roads, logging roads into that area.
18 And that herd, I know -- I feel is a lot smaller than some other
19 herds in other areas but yet that's still registration.

20

21 MR. WILLIS: Pete, you may want to submit a proposal to
22 the state game board to make that a limited entry hunt, drawing
23 permit hunt, like some of the other areas, if the access is now
24 such that high numbers of people can get in there. As you say,
25 the reason that the state had that as a registration hunt was
26 because there was limited access because that is one of the
27 smaller herds and one that's being watched pretty closely. It's
28 too Larry's

29

30 MR. SQUARTSOFF: One of the loggers at -- there's only
31 three families left at the Afognak logging camp and one of the
32 guys there told me there's been at least 16 elk taken from that
33 area this year and that's the subsistence area. But the state
34 had it open to registration.

35

36 MR. WILLIS: True. Yeah, that's something that probably
37 should be brought to Larry VanDale's attention. He may be aware
38 of it. He may submit it himself next year if he thinks that's
39 getting to be a problem. But certainly something needs to be
40 discussed.

41

42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: What kind of options seem to be
43 available there? The state is running competition here with a
44 drawing hunt as opposed to the federal subsistence hunt. It
45 certainly is not in line with our discussions and our intents as
46 to not to damage the herd any further whether -- I'm just trying
47 to think of the options that might be there. For one, is close
48 the private lands I guess for access. Any thoughts on that?

49

50 MR. LUKIN: I feel it's a real touchy situation here.

00046

1 We've had a heck of a time trying to get that little hunt there
2 and then this happens. If you take 16 elk out of it on the same
3 year, if we took 10 or 12 off of it on a subsistence hunt, that's
4 probably a little better than twice what we want to take out of
5 there being the herd being so small.

6
7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. My biggest concern is because of
8 subsistence you can only go in there by boat but registration you
9 can drive in.

10
11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, Liz.

12
13 MS. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman, Elizabeth Andrews, Department
14 of Fish and Game. Steve Machida will be back shortly for a bit
15 this afternoon and he's the management biologist for our
16 department that covers that region. I know you're familiar,
17 perhaps, with Larry VanDale who's the new area biologist for the
18 Kodiak area. But it's probably useful for him to hear some of
19 these concerns also. In the state system, of course, there's the
20 advisory committee system and the game board will be taking up
21 this region at their March meeting and proposals are due in early
22 December. So if any of you work with any of the local advisory
23 committees, that's certainly a place to also bring this up for
24 discussion.

25
26 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. But I know I'm not speaking
27 just for myself but as a past member for the subsistence advisory
28 council in Kodiak as well as I know some of these others that
29 have sat on it, it has totally gone unheard, unacknowledged and
30 absolutely undealt with. We do not feel that is an option we
31 have.

32
33 MS. ANDREWS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess that's something we need to
36 discuss and I -- at this point I don't know -- are we going to
37 have any time for proposals in for the upcoming -- next year? I
38 guess that would be my first concern as to what kind of action we
39 can look forward to taking.

40
41 MS. MASON: Mr. Chairman, the regional council can submit
42 a proposal or the individual members can but that -- it's at this
43 meeting that you're expected to come up with some proposals.

44
45 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Right. But like I say, I feel it's very
46 difficult because we're unacknowledged by the state and it's the
47 state management plan that is impeding the subsistence hunt to
48 which, you know, there's no secret of conflict there. And as to
49 whether we have any jurisdiction at this time to even come up
50 with a proposal other than the fact to which maybe we might have

00047

1 some success in having the private land owners close those areas.

2

3 MS. MASON: Yeah. I wasn't speaking to that.

4

5 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair, I would like to see the results
6 of this first year's hunt before we decide what we need to do in
7 the subsequent year, if any changes need to be made. I assume
8 that Robert Stovall will have something to report on this year's
9 subsistence hunt and when Steve Machida gets back maybe we can
10 get a report from him on the state hunt so far. But the state
11 hunt, as I recall, runs for another month or so. Is that right,
12 Pete?

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I think so.

15

16 MR. WILLIS: I think it runs to the end of November. So
17 we might need to see what happens through that period of time
18 before we try to make any changes to what we've already created.
19 You know, a lot of thought and discussion went into that hunt
20 that we set up this year. The council did some good work on that
21 and I'd kind of like to see how it pans out before we start
22 making dramatic changes to it.

23

24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes. I'm just wondering myself. It's
25 a difficult issue. As you explained, we spent a lot of time on
26 this and it's in direct -- the state's authority has direct
27 conflict with what we had tried to achieve both with the user and
28 the resource.

29

30 MR. WILLIS: You have to remember that there's a
31 relatively small amount of federal land and a great deal of state
32 land right in that area. So anything we do on federal land as
33 far as limiting other hunters would really be a fairly small
34 limitation because the herd doesn't spend that much time on
35 federal land. So it's not like we have a real large area which
36 is mostly federal land that could be closed, for instance.
37 You're still going to have access to all that state land and
38 private land in the same area.

39

40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, but my understanding the whole
41 thing for having that area open for registration was because of
42 the lack of access.

43

44 MR. WILLIS: That's true.

45

46 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But now there's logging roads going into
47 that area so there's no more lack of access.

48

49 MR. WILLIS: That's right. As I said earlier, I think
50 that's something that needs to be brought up with the area -- the

00048

1 state area biologist to see if they want to limit access on the
2 state and private lands hunt. Yeah, we discussed that at the
3 last meeting. There were concerns about the fact that the
4 logging roads were being punched further and further in toward
5 the federal land. And the concern was that people who had access
6 to those roads would be able to -- would have an extreme
7 advantage over other subsistence users coming in from areas by
8 boat or by plane and did not have access to those roads. And
9 that's the reason for the road closure for the fact that access
10 was limited to boats only for the federal hunt. That was to make
11 sure that all subsistence users were on equal footing because
12 they had, what, a month to hunt prior to the opening of the state
13 season.

14
15 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But only with boat access.

16
17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Now as you speak of state land, are you
18 speaking of state managed lands

19
20 MR. WILLIS: Right. State managed lands. I guess that's
21 mostly private land in there. There might be some state land.
22 I'm not sure. You're correct, state managed lands.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess -- what is the wish of the
25 council here, to do nothing at this time or at least -- I would
26 like to recommend at least a letter into the private land owners
27 to bring the issue that we have before them to hopefully get some
28 support.

29
30 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just wanted this council to be aware
31 of what's happening there because of subsistence hunting.

32
33 MR. LUKIN: I thought the state had the authority to shut
34 an area down when a certain number was reached, closing the area.

35
36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: They do have -- I don't know what the
37 guideline harvest is for that though.

38
39 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: We shall see what the final biology --
40 or what has become of this last hunt. I would not like to see
41 this go into the continuing hunting area.

42
43 MR. WILLIS: There's kind of a general guideline of 10
44 percent harvest of the herd and maybe up to 10 percent depending
45 on the productivity of the herd. I don't know that that's
46 written down anywhere other than possibly on a state management
47 plan. But that's correct that the state can close that hunt
48 immediately if they decide that enough animals have been taken
49 out of there. And hopefully Steve will be back in a few minutes
50 and we can pick his brain and see if he knows what's happened to

00049

1 date.

2

3 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: But how would that work? Let's say
4 there was 20 percent taken. Would that diminish the taking of
5 the subsistence out of that same area?

6

7 MR. WILLIS: Well, the subsistence hunt occurs prior to
8 the state hunt.

9

10 MR. STOVALL: This is Robert Stovall again. Once again,
11 this speaks back to my agency report but the subsistence hunt was
12 from September 1 through 25. The refuge issued 10 permits. Port
13 Lyons issued one permit and Ouzinkie issued one permit for a
14 total of 12 permits, that I'm aware of, that I've been able to
15 check back with my village contacts and from our own records.
16 Out of those permits, four people went hunting, seven people did
17 not even attempt to hunt due to the weather in that time of
18 September. If 16 elk have been harvested from that particular
19 area, especially in the area on the refuge, it had to be after
20 September 25 and during registration hunt. And if that many elk
21 were legally hunted and were registered as taken, the state would
22 be aware of that and would recommend probably immediate closure.
23 That has been the way it has been working because I think the
24 population in general for that area, and this is off the refuge
25 and on the refuge, is about 160 animals. So 10 percent would be
26 16 animals. None were taken off the federal lands with the
27 federal registration permit that I'm aware of.

28

29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: As we're aware, it being a small area
30 and the elk can move around, is what I guess I'm saying is if
31 there was over harvest by our general rule of thumb and it
32 diminished a herd enough the following year, that could very well
33 affect the subsistence hunt.

34

35 MR. WILLIS: I don't really think it would, Mark, for the
36 very reasons that you just said. It's a small amount of land and
37 access is limited. As Pete brought up access is changing but we
38 took care of that problem on the federal hunt by restricting it
39 to boat only. I don't think that the subsistence hunters hunting
40 on the federal lands would ever be a threat to that herd unless
41 it was shot down into a really unhealthy state, which I don't
42 believe the state will allow to happen with their hunt. I don't
43 anticipate that the state hunt, even if they took 16 animals and
44 it was closed by emergency order, that's not going to affect what
45 we do next year with the federal subsistence hunt because we
46 simply are not going to have that much impact on that herd.

47

48 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's a lot for me to swallow just for
49 the fact is we have, like you say, the subsistence hunt first but
50 then after the subsistence hunt it's open to -- the same lands

00050

1 are open again then by registration and that's not going to have
2 an effect on the resource?

3

4 MR. STOVALL: If the state is keeping to what they have -
5 - what their present management scheme is, they are monitoring
6 the harvest and when the harvest gets to a point that they feel
7 that it's going to affect the herd, then they stop the harvest.
8 That's what they have done in the past in there. And I would
9 suspect that if the 16 animals have been reported and they've
10 been reported from taken in that particular area, that they will
11 move to limit harvest or stop it. From the regional advisory
12 council's standpoint, because this involves both federal lands
13 and state managed lands, it would be to the benefit of the
14 council to contact the local regional advisory game board in
15 Kodiak and work with them to bring a proposal to the state that
16 will assure that these -- this particular herd is not over
17 harvested. And I realize you may not have the best relationship
18 with them but it's -- if you try to develop a relationship with
19 this council and them, you might be able to achieve a common
20 goal. They don't want to have the herd shut down either, okay.
21 That's going to be their bottom line. So the idea is to try to
22 work together so that they don't have an over harvest situation.
23 That can be done by trying to let them know what you have
24 observed and working from that perspective.

25

26 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: But in all reality when I look at it, it
27 would simply be easier for me to become a registration hunter
28 than a subsistence hunter.

29

30 MR. STOVALL: Most likely.

31

32 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Or open everything for registration or
33 put that back to drawing.

34

35 MR. STOVALL: The only difference between the two hunts
36 is the time. The federal registration hunt is from September 1
37 through 25th. It allows the subsistence hunters the first
38 opportunity at the animals. Other than that, it's exactly the
39 same.

40

41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, but it's the only registration
42 area on the whole island. Yet it doesn't have one of the largest
43 herds on the island.

44

45 MR. STOVALL: That's basically because of the mere fact
46 of access. Access it seems has been breached.

47

48 MR. WILLIS: The reason for the access island the way it
49 was made is so you wouldn't have all the loggers coming over to
50 subsistence hunt on the federal land when it's open a month

00051

1 earlier, you know, because they can drive right to the federal
2 land. That's why the access wasn't able to hold their own.

3

4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, I guess we can just go ahead and
5 monitor to see what the end results are and I think we have other
6 alternatives to deal with this if it does look like it's going to
7 jeopardize the subsistence hunt. Anything else for discussion?
8 If not, we would like to move to Izembek National Wildlife
9 Refuge.

10

11 MR. PORTWOOD: My name is Ray Portwood. I'm with -- I'm
12 an assistant refuge manager at Izembek. I know many of you are
13 probably familiar with Greg Siekaniec the former refuge manager.
14 He's moved on to Washington, D.C. And I'm the acting refuge
15 manager in the interim. There has been a new refuge manager
16 hired for Izembek. His name is Rick Potter and he is coming up
17 from Hawaii. He spent several years on the Alaska Peninsula.
18 He'll be here in November. So, anyway, I was asked to come in
19 today and discuss some of the wildlife sampling and survey
20 methods and procedures we do at Izembek.

21

22 We currently conduct about 15 different types of aerial
23 and ground based wildlife surveys. I guess the most relevant to
24 subsistence would be the caribou herd in the Southern Alaska
25 Peninsula. Of course we are managing the caribou herd under an
26 agreement with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game. The plan
27 has several objectives. One is to manage a herd with a
28 population of 4 to 5,000 animals and to maintain a bull/cow ratio
29 of 20 to 40 bulls per 100 cows. There's several safeguards built
30 into the plan. For example, harvest -- both subsistence and
31 sport harvest harvests will cease when the population drops below
32 2,500 animals, when the bull/cow ratio falls to 15 bulls per 100
33 cows and below that level or when the population is in decline.

34

35 There's several tools that we use to monitor the caribou
36 herd. First of all, we do a winter total population count. It's
37 usually done late January or February. This year it was done in
38 February of '98 and the winter population count was 3,127 animals
39 total population, which is a good sign. I mean the herd's doing
40 pretty well. Secondly, we do a summer cow/calf aggregation
41 count. After the cows calve their photos are taken -- the
42 congregation, we bring those back and get an idea of what
43 percentage of calves are in the population. This was done in
44 July of '98 this year and it shows that we had 21 percent calves,
45 which is actually one of the highest calf percentages in the last
46 24 years. So things are looking very good there.

47

48 The last and final survey we do is a fall composition
49 count. It's generally done in October and it was just completed
50 this past week. Unfortunately I don't have the data from the

00052

1 state as far as what the bull/cow ratio is as far as this
2 October. But -- so as far as setting the season -- or the number
3 of permits, we fell back to the October '97 data from the fall
4 composition count which showed we had 41.7 bulls per 100 cows,
5 which is also very high. So all indications is that the caribou
6 herd on the Southern Alaskan Peninsula is doing very well.
7 Speaking with the state biologists, they're putting satellite
8 telemetry collars on 14 of the animals, some in the northern
9 portion of the peninsula, some in the southern portion. And in
10 doing so they're also conducting these fall composition counts.
11 And speaking with those -- that crew of biologists doing that
12 work, they felt that our caribou herd was in excellent shape.
13 They said the calf weights were very high. The bulls looked to
14 be in excellent shape and the herd in general was doing very
15 well, as good as any herd in the state was their comment. So
16 things look to be going very well.

17
18 Of course we've had a number of animals with satellite
19 collars on them and just the complexity of locating these animals
20 and the adverse weather conditions of flying in and out of Cold
21 Bay, it's been very difficult for us to track these animals'
22 satellite collars. This year we had a study project where we're
23 putting -- it's kind of a satellite -- I guess it's actually a
24 GPS, a global positioning system, by collar and it's read by a
25 satellite weekly. And so we'll get a weekly report of these
26 collared animals that goes into a computer data base and that we
27 can access that information without ever having to leave the
28 ground in Cold Bay. And we'll do that for -- the collars are
29 good for about four years. So what we should have is a weekly
30 record of where these 14 individuals are and then if we see a
31 movement, then we can verify that movement with airplane or
32 surveys or whatever we need to do to confirm that. So we should
33 have much more accurate information as to movement of the herd,
34 whether it's interchanging with the Northern Peninsula or how
35 much interchange is taking place there.

36
37 One of the other things we're looking at this spring,
38 we'll put 40 radio collars on newborn calves and try to get a
39 good handle on what -- where our mortality is coming in the
40 calves. And so right after these calves are born they'll be
41 collared with -- like a breakaway-type collar that as they grow
42 that the collar will fall off. The idea is that in the first few
43 weeks these calves are very vulnerable to predators and mortality
44 is pretty high and we really don't know why it's as high as it
45 is. So during the first few weeks these calves will be tracked
46 with a helicopter and as these calves die and are located through
47 the collar, these biologists can land and investigate the death
48 and see if it's a death resulting from bear mortality or wolf
49 mortality or nutrition or disease and try to get a better feel
50 for what -- why we have such a high calf mortality.

00053

1 Some of the other surveys we do, of course we have -- we
2 do not a real in-depth survey but we have been doing some more
3 with bear monitoring survey. We fly three different areas each
4 year. Each area -- one being the Joshua Green River area and
5 then the northeast side of Unimak Island and the southeast side
6 of Unimak Island. It's an annual survey in August and September
7 when the bears are concentrating on the salmon streams and it
8 gives us kind of a general trend of what the bear population is
9 doing. It's by no means a total population count. Just, you
10 know, through a period of years we know what we should expect to
11 see during that time of the year under those conditions. And
12 that would indicate that there's a rapid decline or increase in
13 the population if we saw something other. This year, in
14 September of '98, we counted 123 bears in the Joshua Green River
15 area. The count there has been as high as 168 bears, which is a
16 very dense population of brown bears in 160 square miles.

17
18 We also do a considerable amount of waterfowl monitoring
19 and surveys throughout the year. We document about 27 species of
20 waterfowl as well as marine mammals. And the flights we've done
21 throughout the year but they intensify, of course, during this
22 time of year when we have a lot of birds migrating in. September
23 and October we do -- we intensify the surveys, do quite a number
24 of surveys and try to keep up with the building populations. We
25 generally fly a standardized route. We begin at St. Catherine's
26 Cove and fly the northeast corner of Unimak Island and then come
27 up through the Izembek Lagoon and Ikensaroff Lagoon complex. And
28 some of the information -- for example, the fall of 1997 survey
29 flights documented an average of 130,000 black brandts, and
30 46,000 Canada geese, 16,500 stellar eiders, and 2,600 emperor
31 geese. We have flown some surveys this year. Our latest survey
32 we're still putting the data together so I don't have it. But
33 the numbers are looking very similar to previous years, no
34 indications we have any problems with waterfowl.

35
36 In addition to doing the aerial surveys we do some
37 productivity work with black brandt and emperor geese where we go
38 out and observe family groups of brandt and geese and count
39 juveniles versus adults and get some idea of productivity. For
40 example, this week we have biologists with migratory birds out
41 and that's his mission at Izembek and count thousands of black
42 brandt and do productivity work on those birds and see, you know,
43 if productivity is where it should be.

44
45 One of the other things we've been doing at Izembek is
46 work on stellar eiders and 1,000 eiders were captured each year.
47 And those unbanded birds were banded and then each year we get
48 recaptures and band returns and data that those birds are still
49 out there in the population. We band new birds. That began kind
50 of in our migratory birds division and has now turned over kind

00054

1 of into a refuge project. It's more of a maintenance. And so
2 we've got a tremendous amount of data there and we've dropped the
3 goal down from 10,000 to about 2,500 birds with the idea that
4 about 40 percent of the birds we're catching are already banded.
5 And so we should be able to just kind of monitor that situation.
6

7 We get recaptures and band returns and data that those
8 birds are still out there in the population. We band new birds.
9 That began kind of in our Migratory Birds Division, and has now
10 turned over kind of into a refuge project as more of a
11 maintenance. And so we've got a tremendous amount of data there,
12 and we've dropped the goal down from 10,000 to about 2,600 birds
13 with the idea that about 40 percent of the birds we're catching
14 are already banded. And so we should be able to just kind of
15 monitor that situation with a fewer number of birds.
16

17 That's about really all I'd bring out today, unless you
18 have questions concerning specific areas maybe I'll help you
19 with.
20

21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Pete?
22

23 MR. PORTWOOD: Yes?
24

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: With the stellars, are -- is the
26 population main- -- I mean, holding its own, or is it decreasing
27 or increasing or.....
28

29 MR. PORTWOOD: Well, our banding effort, I don't really
30 know if the population -- what the population is doing to be
31 honest with you, Pete. I think Rod King's going to speak a
32 little bit about migratory birds. Are you going to address
33 stellars eiders at all? No?
34

35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, I.....
36

37 MR. KING: Stellar eiders are.....
38

39 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Let me.....
40

41 MR. KING:an endangered species, so they are a
42 species that are a species that are concerned, and in fact we
43 have very few breeding left as compared to many years ago.
44

45 COURT REPORTER: (Indiscernible, away from microphone)
46

47 MR. KING: Sorry.
48

49 MR. PORTWOOD: One thing, I do have some.....
50

00055

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, the reason I was.....

2

3 MR. PORTWOOD:information here on.....

4

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF:asking that question is because
6 like the limit was 15 a day, and then it goes from 15 to zero
7 when they shut it down.

8

9 MR. PORTWOOD: Well, they're currently listed. I think
10 they're listed as threatened, the breeding population in Alaska,
11 so, I mean, listed as a threatened species or endangered species.
12 You wouldn't expect to have any type of harvest.

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, but, you know, I always wonder,
15 well, how would you go from 15 to nothing, I mean, just like
16 that. I mean, you know, it should have -- it seemed like there
17 should be some, wow, we're starting to get less birds, we could
18 drop the harvest down to two or five or three or whatever, but it
19 goes from 15 to zero.

20

21 MR. PORTWOOD: I can understand your.....

22

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just like the king crab.

24

25 MR. PORTWOOD: Yeah, I understand what you're saying, but
26 I'm not personally familiar with the history of stellar eiders.
27 I could look into that for you and get back to you.

28

29 MR. KING: Rod King, Fish and Wildlife Service, Migratory
30 Birds out of Fairbanks. Excuse me.

31

32 Basically the reason that they went from 15 to zero is
33 because the stellar eider was still being considered whether it
34 would be added to the endangered species list a year ago, and
35 during the past year it was indeed added to the list, and
36 therefore there would be no legal take of eiders, and that's why
37 it went to zero. Granted, that if we would have had enough data
38 to show a long decline on stellar eiders, then we should probably
39 have seen a decrease in take, or legal take, allowed harvest, but
40 that wasn't the case. Our data is just showing a loss of nesting
41 birds. And so therefore once that was established that the
42 Alaskan subpopulation of stellar eiders was indeed in danger and
43 was placed on the list, then there would be no legal take. And
44 that's why it went to zero.

45

46 MR. SQUARTSOFF: And my concern isn't only stellar
47 eiders, but I don't -- I really don't want to see this happening
48 to other species, to go from 15 to zero.

49

50 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: How often are your surveys done on

00056

1 something like this, on endangered or threatened species?

2

3 MR. KING: Well, it depends on the species, but, for
4 example, the stellar eider, we do two surveys on the Arctic
5 Coastal Plain, the North Slope, for all migratory birds, and that
6 would be a breeding population. Our population estimates there
7 are approximately six to 10,000 birds, but the problem was that
8 on the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge, data indicated that
9 populations went from several thousands to almost none for
10 production and nesting.

11

12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: And in what kind of survey period time
13 though? I mean, from when -- if it was surveyed at a high when
14 there was 15 to zero, how much time was lapsed in between them
15 surveys I guess is what I'm saying.

16

17 MR. KING: Well, it was -- You know, the annual breeding
18 pair survey across the State has been done for 35 years. The
19 trouble is.....

20

21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So it's done annually?

22

23 MR. KING: Yeah. The trouble is that stellar eider have
24 never been at a sufficient density to get good data from our
25 transects, and until we documented on the ground plots from what
26 refuge and migratory bird personnel did for the past 15 years,
27 that the stellar eider were indeed not nesting, then there was --
28 that's when the concern came about. And so we don't have a good
29 string of reliable data for that to say that the whole population
30 may be threatened, but it wasn't until we saw the nesting problem
31 on two areas basically. The North Slope we've never got ground-
32 based nesting information, but we're tracking, quote, a portion
33 of the population. But we've always had some birds like in the
34 Nelson Lagoon, Port Moller, thousands of birds congregate, the
35 Izembek Refuge, thousands of stellar eiders congregate. But when
36 we finally sat down and addressed the whole population, as much
37 data as we could get on it all over, Russia, Bristol Bay, then it
38 was determined that Alaska really was -- had a problem with
39 production for stellar eiders, and that's why it was decided that
40 we should -- that we should not have any take in Alaska.

41

42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: If we're on an annual survey, why are we
43 in a lack of data?

44

45 MR. KING: Well, like I said before, there has never been
46 sufficient numbers of birds to generate a good population
47 estimate on a breeding pair survey, and that's the only annual
48 survey we have. We couldn't -- from a transect where we take a
49 small sample of several lines, we could never say, oh, yeah,
50 there's only 6,000 birds, or, yeah, there's only 2,000. We could

00057

1 not say that that's really what the population was, because we
2 couldn't get enough in the sample, in that transect width. And
3 I can explain a little bit of that when we talk about some of the
4 emperors, too, but I just wanted to explain why it went to zero.
5 Thank you.

6
7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Getting back to the Izembek, I guess one
8 concern I have, of course, here is you made the statement that
9 unless we have a threshold of 2500, sports and subsistence
10 hunting will discontinue below this threshold. We do not have a
11 threshold that differs between a subsistence hunt and a sports
12 hunt then? In other words, it's either open or its closed,.....

13
14 MR. PORTWOOD: Well,.....

15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:which is where I'm having a problem
17 with.....

18
19 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay. Maybe I can.....

20
21 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:our tier system.

22
23 MR. PORTWOOD: Yeah. You know, just -- I guess back in
24 the 80s there was a sports hunt, and since then the population
25 has crashed basically. And so if we look over a period of years,
26 -- well, the population peaked as you can see in 1983 at over
27 10,000 animals. Okay. As it began a rapid decline, I believe
28 it's in the early 90s, it finally reached a level at around 2,000
29 and below. I think it went to 1600 or so, where first sport
30 hunting was closed, and then all hunting was closed. And now
31 we're back to allowing subsistence hunting only. So it's a very
32 limited take right now. For example, last year we had 100
33 permits issued for subsistence only. No sport harvest. And
34 those were divided between five communities: King Cove, Cold
35 Bay, False Pass, Nelson Lagoon, Sand Point. And that was based
36 on our caribou herd monitoring that this -- the we flew showed
37 that the herd could again support some harvest.

38
39 And the herd is building again. It's rising, things look
40 very good and productive for the herd. It's going to continue to
41 grow from everything we know. So this year we issued 125
42 permits, increased the number of permits, and then based on the
43 composition count that was done last week, I mean, everything
44 looked good up to that point, assuming that that composition
45 count, or the bull/cow ration will be good, then we have an
46 opportunity to even increase this year's harvest by 50 more
47 permits. So we've gone from 100 last year to 125, potentially
48 175 this year, strictly subsistence. And I think when we reach
49 a point where the herd is back up to four to 5,000 animals, then
50 the biologists believe that then that herd could probably support

00058

1 a sport hunt in addition, if all the subsistence need is met.

2

3 Of course, one of the purposes of Izembek Refuge is to
4 provide for continued subsistence use. So the way we look at the
5 caribou herd is if we don't have enough animals to support the
6 need for subsistence, then we need to fulfill that need as a
7 purpose of the refuge prior to going in and encouraging a
8 statewide hunt for sport hunters.

9

10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Certainly I ask that, and I look at the
11 numbers here, we say again, you know, the -- I guess the -- what
12 you're trying to meet is the count of -- and reach a stable
13 somewhere between four and 5,000 animals, whereas we're at 3100
14 and still a limited subsistence hunt.

15

16 Now, as what I relate that to is one of the major reasons
17 given us for the decline was because of the range conditions.
18 How has that compared today with the increase? I know at this --
19 at that time when the range condition was the one everybody's
20 pointing their finger at, and said it might not be years before
21 we even know again.

22

23 I'm trying to get a comparison there. Is the range back
24 in good condition again? What.....

25

26 MR. PORTWOOD: I know what the.....

27

28 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:has changed?

29

30 MR. PORTWOOD: I know that there has been some botanists
31 come out and do some research on the range. I don't know what
32 the status of that information is, or what data we've received
33 from that, but certainly any time you, or I would think in most
34 cases, any time you have a population built to a level, you have
35 a crash. You know, certainly you could suspect that the habitat
36 just wouldn't support 10,000 caribou, so then you have disease or
37 malnutrition come in and eliminates a large portion of the
38 population. And so, you know, looking now that the population
39 crashed, perhaps there's been adequate time for the range to
40 recover, and it will now again support more caribou, and we're
41 seeing -- that's kind of what we're seeing, is caribou in very
42 good health, very good weights, you know, good calf survivalship
43 and the herd is building.

44

45 And so, you know, it's kind of a -- from what I
46 understand, I'm new to Alaska and new to caribou management
47 issues, but from what I've been told, caribou management's kind
48 of a boom and bust thing. A very difficult herd to manage. They
49 tend to historically rise and crash, and rise and crash. So
50 ideally we like to control that, prevent them from ever getting

00059

1 to that over-populated stage that they degrade the habitat that
2 will support them, because it takes years and years to recover.
3 Once you crash, the damage is done.

4
5 So I -- you know, I can't give you the historical end,
6 because I've only been here about six months in the State, but
7 what I can say is that I'm very comfortable with what we're
8 doing. We're allowing for increasing harvest as the herd builds,
9 and it looks like we have a very healthy herd, and, you know,
10 next year I would expect us to increase the harvest again. But
11 I think we need to be cautious. I mean, we need to take care of
12 the herd. It's in everybody's benefit.

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess my point is that if the range
15 conditions were what was accused of the crash, number one, is the
16 range in good enough condition where it's going to support 5,000
17 animals yet, or is it going to create the same problem again in
18 a shorter period of time? I know that's a tough question, but,
19 you know, I was given the range conditions as the primary reason.

20
21 MR. PORTWOOD: I can understand your question. I don't
22 know that I'll have an answer for you.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

25
26 MR. PORTWOOD: I don't know that -- well, I do know that
27 nobody's out there doing extensive research on the habitat, you
28 know, and with that in mind, -- but there are several things we
29 can look at in general, you know.

30
31 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess I'm asking if that was the
32 reason given, then why isn't more research done in that area?

33
34 MR. PORTWOOD: My guess is all it boils down to funding
35 and manpower.

36
37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure. Okay. One other question that I
38 had here.

39
40 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: We had 20 percent, 21 percent basically
43 calf production. Of that calf production, do you have any idea
44 what kind of survival rate we had of that 21 percent? I mean, 21
45 percent was the reproduction rate, but what -- do we have any
46 idea what the survival rate was of those calves? When we say
47 there was a lot of calves lost, I'm trying to get an idea in
48 comparison to that 21 percent, what is a lot?

49
50 MR. GUNDERSON: Mr. Chairman, the State has just finished

00060

1 a survey that he was referring to here just a little bit ago. I
2 spoke to -- the people stayed at my place in Nelson Lagoon. They
3 had some problems with their helicopter.

4
5 They said that the vegetation that the caribou feed on is
6 in real good shape. The herd is probably the healthiest they've
7 seen in a long time. Their numbers are good. They realize that
8 these animals cannot possibly reproduce this fast if they can
9 only have one calf a year, so they're moving in from other areas.
10 I think they finally -- the State biologists have admitted that
11 they were wrong on some of the accusations that they have made.
12 But the numbers -- the feds' numbers and the State's numbers
13 don't always correlate exactly what the numbers really are.
14 There's still a difference in how they feel.

15
16 I think one of the things we've got to look at real
17 carefully before we start addressing any sports hunt, this opener
18 that we've had for subsistence for the communities in that region
19 was a very limited subsistence. Those 15 permits that went to
20 Nelson Lagoon, would cover approximately one-third the
21 population. The same thing with King Cove, Sand Point. Our --
22 we've got three -- we need three times as many animals as there
23 was in that first go around on the permits to -- just to cover
24 the subsistence use of our local people.

25
26 And I think all those numbers have got to be taken into
27 consideration before any sports hunt could be taken a look at, or
28 we will be back into the same predicament we were just a couple
29 years ago, or ten years ago. You know, just when things are
30 looking rosy, everybody wants to go full bore, but I know there's
31 a lot of pressure by the guides and everything to get this open
32 for a sports hunt, but I don't feel that's -- I think we should
33 cover ourselves first.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Paul, that's what I concur
36 with, and that was the basic point I was trying to get
37 acknowledged here as to sport hunting opening again when the
38 subsistence needs are 30 percent at best.

39
40 MR. PORTWOOD: Yeah.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: One other question here. What was the
43 count on Unimak Island?

44
45 MR. PORTWOOD: The count last year on Unimak Island was
46 not conducted, so the previous year's count I believe was 600
47 animals.

48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

50

00061

1 MR. PORTWOOD: And we allowed 60 permits this year, and
2 that seemed to be more than were wanted or requested. I think
3 last year a lot of the -- I think we had 60 -- 50 or 60 last
4 year, and there was just a handful of animals taken on Unimak.
5 So it's -- the last count we had was about 600 animals on Unimak,
6 and then this past winter count was not conducted due to weather
7 and some plane problems, and.....

8
9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Will there be one this year?

10
11 MR. PORTWOOD: Yes, there should be. I mean, it's our
12 intent to conduct a complete count, including Unimak.

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay.

15
16 MR. PORTWOOD: Yes.

17
18 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: One other question I guess that rings
19 out in my mind is did -- I know that the Council was pretty
20 adamant about when we change the survey process that we would
21 have a council member with the survey team. I know that Melvin,
22 the person that was with the Survey team last year, is no longer
23 with the Council. Has there been any indication as to trying to
24 find out another council member who would be willing to?

25
26 MR. PORTWOOD: Well, I know as far as the refuge, we're
27 very interested in continuing that practice, to have someone in
28 a plane actually counting as far as caribou. I mean, you're
29 basically just counting animals. And I think that was a very
30 positive thing from what I've been told. We have every intention
31 to continue that. I don't know if our biologist, Mike Roy, has
32 contacted somebody or what steps he's made to do that, but I can
33 certainly check with him and encourage him to continue that
34 direction.

35
36 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I would request that you do find out
37 when it is planned, and so we have ample time to.....

38
39 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay.

40
41 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:make sure that one of our council
42 members.....

43
44 MR. PORTWOOD: Sure.

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:is selected to be with your team at
47 that time.

48
49 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum. Sure will. There's also been
50 some talk about even expanding that then to, you know, having

00062

1 someone come along and assist in some waterfowl survey counts, or
2 just how we do this.

3
4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

5
6 MR. PORTWOOD: It's a little more difficult counting
7 birds in that you're trying to identify species and count groups
8 of thousands that are flying and flushing and moving, and it
9 takes more of a trained eye or biologist to identify by species
10 and count groups and -- but it would be good to have somebody in
11 the plane and just have them fly the transects and kind of do a
12 count, and then maybe do a count with an observer, so that you do
13 have a good understanding of what we're seeing in an over-all
14 picture, maybe not the specific numbers, but, you know, you could
15 know there's 100,000 birds or there's 10,000. And certainly we
16 want to encourage all the cooperation that we can with the native
17 people there.

18
19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I just think it's positive in all ends,
20 that certainly I think there's a lot of local knowledge that can
21 be exchanged with scientific reasoning,.....

22
23 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

24
25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:not saying that either one is
26 complete to.....

27
28 MR. PORTWOOD: I agree.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:give grounds on, but it certainly
31 does improve the relationship an awful lot.

32
33 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

34
35 MR. GUNDERSON: Yeah, I think it's real good, too, a good
36 practice for whoever gets into the management position on the
37 refuge, or any refuge, that there is -- with communities in the
38 area, to have the manager go into the communities, speak with the
39 people, talk with -- about what the numbers of the animals,
40 birds, fish, whatever that's in question. I know Greg Siekaniec
41 started this when he took over the refuge down there, and got a
42 good rapport working with the communities. They did a good job
43 of cataloging with -- what was available, or what was around in
44 the country. They got a partnership working with the communities
45 and the refuge personnel. And it -- that way we're not both
46 standing on both -- on two different sides of the fence.

47
48 We've had a lot of problems over the years, I imagine
49 most refuges have. They'd throw in a manager or a biologist or
50 whatever to take over the position. In a number of instances

00063

1 they stay for a long period of time, and somehow those critters
2 become his or hers, other than the people that live there. And
3 it's very discouraging to the communities, and I think a good,
4 open relationship between the manager and the community -- and
5 all the communities is really important.

6
7 MR. FOSTER: How long -- if things keep on going as they
8 are, how long would -- before you would expect a sport hunt to be
9 allowed?

10
11 MR. PORTWOOD: Well, that's a good question, and, you
12 know, I would expect the State to step forward and offer a sport
13 hunt. A lot of land down there is State land. A lot of the herd
14 is on State land, and at some point they would -- you know, we
15 would want to work together. But I'd say we have to be up in
16 that 4,000 -- four to 5,000 animal range. I mean that's the
17 optimum population that we're looking for.

18
19 MR. FOSTER: So is that two years, three years?

20
21 MR. PORTWOOD: You know, I'm not a caribou biologist. I
22 don't know how fast they reproduce. I don't think it's very
23 fast.

24
25 MR. FOSTER: Yeah.

26
27 MR. PORTWOOD: So we might be looking -- you know, I
28 don't have an educated number, but I would say it would be a
29 number of years.

30
31 MR. FOSTER: Yeah. You see, we're -- I'm a little more
32 gung ho on a sports hunt than the rest of the guys, and it
33 doesn't have anything to do with sport. It has to do with
34 accessibility. All the permits that we gave out last year in
35 Sand Point, very few were used, because the closest piece of
36 federal land is five hours away by boat. So all that land is
37 nice and close by, it's all State land, and those darn caribou,
38 they just don't pay any attention at all to them imaginary lines.
39 They just.....

40
41 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like the people.

42
43 MR. FOSTER: Yeah.

44
45 (Laughter)

46
47 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess one other concern I'd just like
48 to throw in there is -- was the invitation that I had to Naknek
49 on the Northern Caribou Herd, Peninsula. I guess I was aghast
50 after working through the South Peninsula Caribou Herd, I don't

00064

1 think caribou differ that much in that close proximity. But
2 trying to understand the management of the northern herd, I come
3 to find out there was no thresholds, there was -- I couldn't find
4 anything that they used as a management tool, other than sheer
5 guesstimate of count. I guess my question is we are trying to
6 utilize the best we know how to use management tools, but in that
7 case there was a zero management tool. So my question is, what
8 other means do they have to manage something like caribou? I
9 know it's a difficult question, but I guess my point is flat and
10 direct. We found out what can happen on the South Peninsula
11 Herd.

12

13 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

14

15 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: What's going to keep this same thing
16 from happening in the northern herd, which is just a couple areas
17 away?

18

19 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum. Well, I can see your concern. I
20 picked up on that when you mentioned it earlier this morning, and
21 I was kind of surprised that there wasn't a management plan in
22 place similar to what we have. And my thought was, well, perhaps
23 the herd has never reached a point of decline, or maybe it's
24 always been a healthy herd, or things have been fairly well
25 balanced. I don't know. I don't know the history of the herd or
26 the management. I know it's a much larger herd and perhaps not
27 as intensively managed or, you know, maybe.....

28

29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum. The situation was that it was
30 not a Government concern, but it was the people's concern. They
31 seen the diminishment of the caribou.

32

33 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

34

35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I mean, if this isn't traditional local
36 knowledge that brings the concern, is -- I guess where is my
37 trust in the Government's responsibility to ensure?

38

39 MR. PORTWOOD: Well, I can't speak for what happened on
40 another refuge in the Northern Peninsula, but, you know, I guess
41 my idea is it -- That's very valuable information, whether it's
42 -- you know, it's not biological surveys, it's not hard and fast
43 data, but it is observations that people have had over numbers of
44 years, something that we may not be aware of. So, you know, my
45 personal opinion is certainly -- I guess that's what prompted the
46 closure of the hunt. I'm not that familiar with it, but my idea
47 is that we should be working with all parties involved. You have
48 a very vested interest in the caribou herd, as we do. And if
49 there's information out there, I'm very open to that information,
50 whatever it would be. And certainly we should be working

00065

1 together, and so, you know, if you're saying that it just went on
2 and on and I believe it just came to a complete closure, didn't
3 it, the northern caribou herd? I mean, wasn't it just closed
4 this.....

5
6 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Not to my knowledge,.....

7
8 MR. PORTWOOD: Or was it just sport.....

9
10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:but it was just.....

11
12 MR. PORTWOOD:hunt was closed?

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:a real concern that they did not
15 want to lose the subsistence.....

16
17 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay.

18
19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:hunt as that happened in the South
20 Peninsula Caribou Herd.

21
22 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: It was a real concern. Here again, just
25 because this wasn't expensive information didn't mean it wasn't
26 legitimate information. And these are the questions we are
27 asking back to the State or the refuge managers,.....

28
29 MR. PORTWOOD: Uh-hum.

30
31 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:whoever it may be, why don't we
32 have a management tool in place for this herd? I don't know. I
33 don't have an answer.

34
35 MR. PORTWOOD: I don't either, but I.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess I'm not asking you direct, but
38 as an.....

39
40 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:audience here.....

43
44 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay.

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:that what I have learned.....

47
48 MR. PORTWOOD: Certainly.

49
50 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:at this meeting has really

00066

1 dumbfounded me.

2

3 MR. PORTWOOD: Okay. I can understand that, and I would
4 encourage you to ask those agencies in those areas that question
5 and work with them to develop something, because they may want
6 information you have in establishing those thresholds and
7 population objectives, and to take care of the herd.

8

9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Mr. Taylor?

10

11 MR. BRELSFORD: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on this specific
12 point there have been a number of developments since the special
13 action request was before the Board about six weeks ago, and I
14 think for the benefit of the rest of the Council, I'd like to
15 clarify at least several -- at least two or three key things.

16

17 My name is Taylor Brelsford, for the record.

18

19 And first of all, there has been a long-term ecological
20 change or shift in migration patterns and other characteristics
21 of the North Alaska Peninsula Herd. That's been at least a
22 decade in the making, widely observed by local people, and some
23 concerns, localized concerns about causes and impacts on the
24 villages have in fact been raised to the Board, Federal
25 Subsistence Board's attention.

26

27 I think in the instance that you attended, and the
28 meeting that you attended, they would not have had time to go
29 through the lengthy history, and so some of the specific
30 cooperative efforts between some villages and the Board might not
31 have been highlighted, but I do want to mention that in the
32 Chignik area, the villages felt that the change in migration
33 patterns could be due to sport hunting at the height of land
34 between the Pacific and the Bristol Bay sides, and those federal
35 lands were in fact closed. It was one of the early Federal Board
36 actions I was involved in as a staffer probably in '93 or '94.

37

38 Similarly, in the Island Arm area of Becharof Lake, there
39 was a user group conflict or some concern that intensive sport
40 hunting in one peninsula was choking off the migration and
41 diminishing opportunities for the community of Egegik in
42 particular. And again the refuge manager at the Becharof Refuge,
43 with field staff and local people, there was some collaborative
44 work to look more closely at the nature of the sport or guide- --
45 or outfitted hunting activity in that location, and some
46 restrictions were put in place and they were essentially
47 successful in alleviating that localized problem.

48

49 Now, this year was new, and as I think when there was
50 reference to a closure, what we're talking about is some field

00067

1 survey work in mid summer following which the Alaska Board of
2 Game made some new restrictions on state lands, and essentially
3 the question before the Federal Board was comparable closure on
4 the federal lands.

5
6 Now, that is a complicated situation in terms of the land
7 status. The federal lands are remote to the villages of Egegik,
8 Port Heiden, Pilot Point, and most of their hunting actually
9 occurs on the state lands nearby. Now, ultimately the Board in
10 this case decided not to adopt the closure, not to adopt the
11 recommendations of the Council, because it was felt -- it was
12 found that the closure action in the highlands would not have the
13 impacts, would not improve subsistence hunting opportunities
14 nearer to the village.

15
16 So there have been several instances of trying to -- of
17 identifying problems and trying to sort them out, some
18 successful, some not quite so, you know, not -- there was no
19 consensus between local people and the Board in this most recent
20 action. They differed. They disagreed, it remained a
21 controversy.

22
23 But the thing I'd like to leave you with is there was a
24 strong commitment by the State, by the Federal Government and by
25 the villages, BBNA took a strong lead role in convening all of
26 the parties in this cooperative planning meeting that was held in
27 Naknek in the last week of September. So I think what I would
28 urge you to see is that there's a consistent commitment from the
29 Board and from the other agencies to recognizing when it's time
30 to have those cooperative, those all-party cooperative management
31 meetings. And sometimes we're later, you know, in retrospect,
32 maybe they should have been doing this two years ago, or three
33 years ago, when the Chigniks first came forward. But I think the
34 commitment is consistent, the realization that you've got to have
35 all the people involved looking at what the status of the
36 population is, making the best possible sense of what's happening
37 on the -- to the herd, and then, you know, the different land
38 owners who can have different impacts on their lands, the village
39 corporations as well as the federal managers and the state
40 managers. That commitment really took hold this last September,
41 and I would suggest that the minutes of that meeting might be of
42 interest to the council members, just to watch another nearby
43 example of cooperative management planning, and we can make those
44 minutes available to you, and then continue to keep you current
45 on the progress towards a management plan, a multi-party
46 management plan for that herd.

47
48 So I thank you for the chance to clarify that point. It
49 hasn't dropped in a vacuum.

50

00068

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure, but I will also speak strongly not
2 only of hearing from the people, but of experiencing it myself,
3 that when these caribou are on a migration pattern which takes
4 them through the mountain valleys, and you have a camp set up
5 there that not only goes for the trophy bull, the lead bull, but
6 in other words disrupts -- once you start shooting, those caribou
7 turn around and go every which direction to get away from
8 whatever it is that's hunting them. That's where we are having
9 a problem with the migration patterns. When that migration
10 pattern is lost, then who knows. It's not going to be the same.
11 They're not going to migrate to Chignik area, because they're cut
12 off in the mountain passes. That was a very strong, and I think
13 a very valid point. Unfortunately caribou are coming through the
14 mountain passes, and you know what happens when you shoot at a
15 flock of ducks, they all go. There's no difference except for
16 the caribou don't have the option of going any direction they
17 want. They're driven backwards then.

18
19 Thank you, Taylor.

20
21 Is there any other comment or questions for Izembek?

22
23 MR. FOSTER: Could I ask you about the emperor geese, how
24 they're doing?

25
26 MR. PORTWOOD: I think Rod King's going to address
27 emperor guess.

28
29 MR. FOSTER: Oh, okay.

30
31 MR. CRATTY: I think we all pretty much got the point
32 though.

33
34 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Ray, appreciate it.

35
36 Mr. Stovall, I guess -- were you the one going to give
37 the report on the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge?

38
39 MR. STOVALL: Yeah. This is Robert Stovall again at the
40 Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge. I've already stated a few
41 things of my report already in other testimony, but I'll just go
42 and briefly touch on some of the main on-going biological
43 inventories and surveys and studies that are being done on
44 Kodiak.

45
46 I'll start out with the Kodiak brown bear. There's two
47 main population surveys that are being done. They are the stream
48 surveys, which are an index completed on some of the major river
49 and lake systems on the refuge, that the intensive area surveys
50 are conducted in specific areas on the refuge. In 1998, this

00069

1 year, we did it in the Sturgeon River area, and along that
2 drainage. That gives us an over-all brown bear population
3 estimate of about 27 to 2900 animals on the refuge.

4
5 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: On this refuge?

6
7 MR. STOVALL: Yeah. There's probably -- there's
8 definitely more off the refuge.

9
10 The -- we've completed the third year of the Thumb Lake,
11 Karluk Lake bear viewing study, and that probably will be
12 finished in its final form, and a report written probably next
13 year for that study. That's being done in cooperation with the
14 Koniag Native Corporation.

15
16 For waterfowl and seabirds,, we do waterfowl production
17 surveys in one drainage -- one drainage per year, and we usually
18 do the drainage two or three times to get statistical
19 information. Looking at the amount of waterfowl in the area, and
20 production that there is of those particular species. We've been
21 doing it in the South Olga Bay area for the last couple of years.
22 And we'll probably have one more year of that to be done.

23
24 We do winter seabirds surveys, looking at -- there are
25 boat surveys, and usually completed in February, and we look at
26 all seabirds found along line transects that are done on a yearly
27 basis. Once a year.

28
29 We've been doing harlequin ducks surveys. They are a --
30 we like to look at them as an indicator species. We've been
31 doing as part of EVOS funding, banding -- trapping and banding,
32 and some genetic blood sampling work with them. And that's on-
33 going surveys, shoreline surveys primarily in the spring, and in
34 the summer production surveys. And the trapping is usually --
35 trapping and banding is occurring in August.

36
37 Bald eagles nesting and production aerial surveys are
38 completed. Every five years we do the entire refuge and then in
39 between that time we do index areas, specific plots within the
40 refuge.

41
42 Fisheries. We do aerial index stream surveys, looking at
43 survey systems, stream systems throughout the refuge, and in
44 particular we're looking at chum, coho, and sockeye salmon runs.
45 This year we had a -- we put in a weir at Sturgeon River to
46 calibrate aerial surveys completed for the chum runs in that
47 system. The weir ran from May 15th through July 22nd, and
48 counted 24 -- a little over 2400 animals -- 2400 fish, chum, in
49 the Sturgeon River. 24,000, I'm sorry. 24,400. This weir will
50 probably run for the next two or three more years, and right now,

00070

1 looking at some of the information that's being gathered from the
2 spawning habitat in the Sturgeon River, we're looking at a little
3 bit of a difference in what type of escapement we should expect
4 for salmon in the Sturgeon River, a lot lower than what it
5 currently is in the management plans with the State.

6
7 We've also been doing non-lethal genetic sampling of the
8 steelhead, chinook in the Karluk, Ayakulik and Sturgeon River
9 systems. And preliminary results indicate significant
10 differences in the populations between river systems.

11
12 Coho genetic sampling is also going on as part of a
13 statewide classification system. Five river systems have been
14 sampled last year and three are to be sampled for this year.
15 That work is probably starting to get -- maybe Lynn might be able
16 to help me out there, Lynn Schwarz. That work probably will be
17 done in wintertime. Winter/fall seasons.

18
19 Sitka black-tailed deer, we continue to do the mortality
20 surveys. They aren't completed in our core refuge index areas.
21 We tried to expand to the Bluefox Bay area to get up into our
22 Afognak kind of first forest habitats, which is an area that we
23 haven't been able to get into up until this year. And this
24 year's numbers were a lot lower than the year before. We had a
25 similar type of winter where we had a heavy snow in
26 November/December, and which usually knocks the population down
27 immediately, and with a high fawn mortality. Then this year,
28 this January, February, March, April, the winter weather became
29 a lot less harsh with very little snow fall, and a lot of rain.
30 That had a tendency to lessen the blow, the continuing blow for
31 fawn mortality. And with that in mind, deer populations are
32 probably as stable, or slight- -- still slightly increasing just
33 looking at some of the mortality survey information.

34
35 We also do browse surveys, and last year we started
36 browse surveys on two areas on the refuge, and we continued in
37 those areas this year, doing browse surveys in the same areas.
38 And we also tried to expand to other areas on the eastern --
39 expanded to Uganik Bay. The east arm of Uganik and Bluefox Bay.
40 Bluefox Bay up once again in Afognak Island.

41
42 For the areas that we did last year, compared to what we
43 did -- what we found this year, the browse was slightly -- was
44 down a little bit lower than last year's browse. The browse
45 amounts. And a possible reason for that could be the mere fact
46 that there was less animals in the lower elevated -- lower
47 elevation, in the shoreline areas. There was probably less deer
48 concentrated in those areas because of the mild winter weather
49 that we had this year compared to last year where there was a
50 little bit -- a little bit more winter mortality counted last

00071

1 year and probably because of the mere fact there as more animals
2 in the area utilizing the browse.

3
4 This year we also tried to do something different with
5 our aerial mortal- -- with our deer mortality surveys. WE tried
6 to do aerial hairpile surveys. We've noticed throughout the
7 years hairpiles that are visible from the air that turn out to be
8 deer carcasses. So we flew, oh, we flew about five different
9 areas around Karluk Lake and Frasier Lake, along the north and
10 western shoreline of Olga Bay, and Red Lake, and the northern
11 part of Sitkalidak Strait to see if we can do aerial surveys of
12 deer carcasses and cover more area, just another index of what's
13 going on, and a little bit better coverage. We tried to get to
14 about ten to 20 percent of the carcasses that we counted from the
15 area to ground truth them and get information that we normally
16 would get during any ground mortality surveys, if we can get it.
17 Usually we look for sex and age and verify that the mortality is
18 starvation mortality by looking at the bone marrow from a long
19 bone.

20
21 I was surprised at the amount of carcasses we found
22 around Karluk Lake. We counted 60 carcasses around the Karluk
23 Lake area, and that's within 300 feet of the shoreline. About
24 300 yards of the shoreline I should say. So we're going to
25 continue to do that next year and see whether we come up with
26 similar type of numbers with -- and follow through with this
27 technique, and cover more -- try to cover more areas of the
28 refuge so we can get a little bit better count of the mortality
29 that's going on.

30
31 We did not get a chance to fly -- I didn't get a chance
32 to fly at least the presubsistence elk hunt surveys that I wanted
33 to, to see where the animals were located at just before the
34 season started. And I'm going to make a lot bigger effort to do
35 that this next year for the elk sur- -- that's part of the elk
36 survey. The State does a distribution of population composition
37 counts of elk, and we normally have deferred and gathered their
38 information from them, get their information from them to make
39 any determinations on what to do with the elk population.

40
41 That's what I had for the biological monitoring that
42 we're doing. I might go ahead and ask for questions before I
43 continue with the rest of my report which deals with public use
44 and subsistence uses on the refuge. So if you have any
45 questions, I'd.....

46
47 MR. LUKIN: I was -- I want to question your count on --
48 your bear count. Is that an increase or a decrease from the bear
49 prior survey?

50

1 MR. STOVALL: I'm going to say that I'm not sure whether
2 it's an increase or decrease. If there was a decrease, I would
3 have -- we would have -- I would have found out that it was a
4 decrease. So I don't think it was a decrease. Whether it was an
5 increase, a significant increase or just what they found in the
6 past, I would not be able to tell you for sure. The intensive
7 area surveys in different areas, and they do them -- they won't
8 get back to that same area for maybe five to six years, seven to
9 eight years, depending on where it's located at. So I don't know
10 when the last time they did the sturgeon area to give an answer
11 to that that would be worthwhile.

12
13 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Given the number that you have here on
14 the bear population, stating that that's on refuge lands only, do
15 you have a guesstimate what the island-wide population is?

16
17 MR. STOVALL: Probably over 3,000 animals, but I wouldn't
18 want to give any more numbers than that, because I don't have the
19 exact numbers for you. They don't have exact numbers. That
20 would be a population estimate.

21
22 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess is what I'm trying to say in
23 proportion of state lands and federal lands, is it fair to say
24 then all the -- most of the bears are on federal land?

25
26 MR. STOVALL: No.

27
28 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: If we say that there's about 26, 2700 on
29 there, and then a total of 3,000, that kind of leaves me
30 wondering.

31
32 MR. STOVALL: Actually I might have overstated that, the
33 total population is probably closer to 3,000 animals, between 27
34 and 3,000, and of that about 70 percent are found on the refuge
35 -- are found on refuge lands. Sixty to 70 percent. So that the
36 number on the refuge wold probably be around 24 to 2500 animals.
37 On refuge lands. And that -- once -- you've got to keep in mind
38 that these are estimates.

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Right. Just one second. The other
41 thing I had, what time of the year do you do your hairpile
42 surveys?

43
44 MR. STOVALL: We're doing the aerial hairpile surveys
45 usually around the end of the spring -- oh, the beginning of
46 spring. Anytime after mid March through May.

47
48 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

49
50 MR. STOVALL: We try to do it when the -- first of all,

00073

1 the snow has to be off the ground in the lower elevations where
2 we do them at, and things have to be brown, because they appear
3 like white dots on the background from the air. That's why we do
4 them at that time of the year. They wouldn't be as visible
5 earlier in the year, or during the wintertime.

6
7 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: When there's still light snow on the
8 ground, it wouldn't be more visible?

9
10 MR. STOVALL: No. When -- the carcasses wouldn't be
11 visible, because, for one thing they could be covered up.

12
13 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure. Sure, but then they blend right
14 in with the vegetation, too, at that time of the year.

15
16 MR. STOVALL: We -- You wouldn't be able to see them if
17 they were covered up by snow.

18
19 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure. Sure. I understand. Greg?

20
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question, but I'm sure he's
22 about to cover it (Indiscernible, away from microphone).

23
24 COURT REPORTER: (Indiscernible, away from microphone)
25 into the microphone. (Indiscernible, away from microphone)

26
27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: You know the process.

28
29 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Actually I really don't want to take
30 the floor. I'll decline.

31
32 MR. STOVALL: If there's no more questions, I'll just go
33 ahead and briefly and quickly follow through with the rest of the
34 -- my report.

35
36 The designated hunter program, for last year we had 37
37 hunters who participated with the bulk of those hunters coming
38 from the Kodiak City and road system area, and some hunters out
39 of Old Harbor and from Larson Bay. They reported 130 deer were
40 taken from the 20 or so designated hunters who had reported back
41 to us. And as of nine- -- as of yesterday, only ten designated
42 hunter permits had been issued from the refuge office for this
43 year.

44
45 As I briefly mentioned earlier, we had six hunters
46 participating in the federal subsistence brown bear hunt for the
47 regulatory year of 97/98. One Akhiok hunter, three from Larson
48 Bay, and two from Old Harbor. And the Larson Bay and Old Harbor
49 hunters were successful, taking five animals, four males and one
50 female.

00074

1 And I also mentioned that the elk hunt from what
2 information I've been able to gather from September 1 through 25,
3 we had a total of 12 permits issued, ten of which came from the
4 refuge headquarters, were issued from the refuge headquarters,
5 one from Port Lions and one from Ouzinkie, and out of those --
6 out of that 12, one permit, I'm not sure what has happened to it,
7 the Port Lions permit. And out of the remainder, four hunters
8 had hunted and were not successful, and seven of the hunters did
9 not hunt, primarily because of weather that was pretty poor. I
10 guess it was pretty windy and/or rainy and stormy during the
11 first two or three weeks of September.

12
13 The federal commercial fish guiding permit regulations
14 are in the process of being written, and with implementation to
15 happen probably within the next couple years. The refuge manager
16 has held a series of public meetings with only Old Harbor left to
17 go, to get input as to how these guiding regulations should be
18 put out. And if -- for any additional information on that, those
19 interested should contact the refuge directly.

20
21 This year the refuge was funded to do a series of public
22 use surveys, including ground and aerial contacts -- aerial
23 surveys and ground contacts I should say. And I have not got any
24 results of those surveys that were completed for the summertime.
25 I might -- I probably could have some of those results by the
26 fall meeting.

27
28 I plan on putting together a waterfowl/migratory bird
29 harvest survey together, baseline data, for development of
30 regulations which would allow subsistence hunting of waterfowl
31 and/or collection of migratory bird parts as is done in this --
32 in Kodiak from a subsistence standpoint. I'm probably going to
33 look to try and get those surveys to the individual villages by
34 the wintertime, and get an idea of the counts, and probably have
35 not a finished product until this time next year.

36
37 The Kodiak summer science salmon camp was very successful
38 this year, its third year of existence, and it was expanded or
39 portions of it was expanded to Old Harbor this last -- this year.

40
41
42 And for land acquisition, the refuge is -- has purchased
43 most all of the large parcels that are going to be purchased any
44 time soon, with negotiations for Koniag for the Karluk River and
45 Sturgeon River areas still on-going. Small purchases are
46 presently being the primary focus of the land acquisition
47 program.

48
49 And that's all I had, if you have any other questions,
50 I'll try to answer them the best I can.

00075

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Hearing none, it sounds like you're of
2 the hook. Thank you, Robert.

3
4 MR. STOVALL: Thank you very much.

5
6 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I request a short break here.

7
8 (Off record)

9 (On record)

10
11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Evidently the click on the microphones
12 wasn't that loud this time, so if we can once again take our
13 positions and see if we can get through another hour or so of
14 this?

15
16 I guess here just to back up just one moment, I would
17 like to make a statement here that had really concerned me, and
18 hopefully that maybe the advisory councils can in this coming
19 year hopefully get a proposal in that's going to defer what we
20 had suspected going on, and what I had visually seen myself as I
21 boarded the plane from King Salmon, and that was to see caribou
22 antlers in the baggage being loaded on the plane with the absence
23 of any meat. That stood out very loud and clear to me. Here as
24 we talk about the caribou herds and the problems we're having
25 with them versus the sports hunting, I believe that we need to
26 have identified stations where meat is being distributed to the
27 communities, that the absence of meat on the airplane is wrong,
28 with lots of antlers, shows that it is very much a trophy hunt
29 going on. Not only that, I know that some of the sports hunters
30 claim that the meat has been given to different communities. I
31 would like to have that backed up by the communities themselves.
32 Not only that, but some of these hunters take these animals while
33 they are in the rut, and the meat is not any good. It doesn't
34 make any difference to them, because they're out after the
35 antlers anyway.

36
37 But that was one situation that really stuck in my mind.
38 I feel we need to address this and make sure that the meat is
39 the ultimate focus, whether it be sport or subsistence, that we
40 do not just have plane loads of antlers coming out of the field.

41
42 So with that in mind, I just wanted to throw that into
43 the Council, and others concerned with the issues that are before
44 us.

45
46 With that said, I guess we had 12 here, Alaska Department
47 of Fish and Game, Larry Van, but I guess he is not available
48 here, so, Elizabeth, were you going to give us a.....

49
50 MS. ANDREWS: Mr. Chairman, Elizabeth Andrews, Department

00076

1 of Fish and Game. Steve Machida, who I mentioned is the
2 management biologist for this area, he's here and he was going to
3 address some of the questions you raised a little earlier in some
4 of your discussion. And then we also have Lynn Schwarz, who's
5 the -- one of the sport fish biologists, and there were some
6 questions about the bust in Mill Bay, and he could answer, you
7 know, address those. And then if you have other questions.
8 There aren't any other prepared reports, but if you had
9 questions, feel free to ask the fish biologist, or game
10 biologist, and then -- and Craig Mishler from Subsistence
11 Division is here also. So Steve would like to address those --
12 some of the questions raised about management plans and caribou
13 herds, and then Lynn would offer a few comments on the concern
14 about the Mill Bay area and so forth.

15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you, Elizabeth.

17
18 MR. MACHIDA: For the record, my name is Steve Machida.
19 I'm the -- with Fish and Game. I'm the management supervisor for
20 Southcentral and Southwest Region.

21
22 There were several questions that were raised so far
23 pertaining to the biology of the Southern Alaska Peninsula Herd,
24 and if you wish, I can address those questions. One pertained to
25 the range condition factors and the other pertained to calf
26 production. If you wish, I could answer those questions, or
27 address them.

28
29 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, thank you. If you would, please.

30
31 MR. MACHIDA: Okay. First, concerning the range
32 condition, the question was, you know, if the herd increased to
33 a large size, and it declined because of range conditions, the
34 question is why is it -- why is the productivity of the herd
35 improved now. I mean, isn't the range factors still an important
36 consideration. And I think there's a number of considerations
37 that you need to be taking into account when you talk about range
38 factors. The way caribou populations normally operate not only
39 in this part of the state, but in the remainder of Alaska is they
40 cycle and they typically -- when they're on the upswing, they
41 typically overshoot the high end of their carrying capacity. In
42 other words, caribou at their max size is normally higher than
43 what the range can support, so if there is a decline, you can
44 almost always attribute it to range factor, whether -- and what
45 happens when the caribou are at -- in the low part of their
46 cycle, the range does have a period of time to recover, but
47 another factor is that since there's less caribou on the range,
48 they need less, and they're able to do quite well, you know, all
49 other things being equal, such as predation and that sort of
50 thing.

00077

1 Another thing that interplays very much with range factor
2 and it wasn't really discussed in the previous report is weather
3 conditions. If you have very good range, but very poor winter
4 weather conditions with a lot of snow and poor weather, this
5 makes -- in a way it makes the range less usable to caribou,
6 because a lot of it gets covered with snow, and the caribou have
7 a harder time making it through the winter, just given the poor
8 winter conditions, so they need better range to survive in
9 conditions of the poorer weather conditions.

10
11 The situation we had last year is we had a low caribou
12 population, and we had relatively mild conditions, and these two
13 factors were conducive for caribou to do quite well, and if you
14 have -- do have mild winter conditions, then the range doesn't
15 have to be in quite as good of shape for caribou populations to
16 do well. So, you know, whenever you talk about range conditions
17 and how well caribou do in terms of reproduction, then it's also
18 very important to qualify that statement with what kind of winter
19 weather conditions are we talking about.

20
21 So do you have any other follow-up questions regarding
22 that?

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess that question derived out of the
25 argument that was presented as far as the decline of the SPCH
26 herd. At that time local knowledge put a lot of accountability
27 into the possibility of the migration, different migration of the
28 caribou, to which at that time management had put a high rating
29 on the decline as far as the range conditions. First of all, we
30 had felt if it was range conditions, to lose 10,000 animals,
31 wouldn't it be like deer? Wouldn't we have hairpiles and things
32 of this nature that would certainly give us a clue to at least
33 consider that? To which was totally absent.

34
35 But now with the rebound of the herd, again that tells us
36 that the range conditions must be fair to good. Here again I
37 don't see any correlation with range stability and individual
38 size of the animals. I don't know if that has ever occurred or
39 has ever been a part of the management.

40
41 MR. MACHIDA: Well, the way that the Department normally
42 does their fall composition survey, which they just finished is
43 not only do they get data on bull/ratios, calf/cow ratios, but
44 they also get -- they also weigh a sampling of calves, and the
45 purpose of this is to look at an index of range conditions,
46 because the size of calves and the amount of fat that are on
47 animals correlates directly very much with range condition. And
48 what this last survey showed is that the size of calves and the
49 amount of fat on adult animals is higher than in the past, which
50 means that the animals are at least for this season are doing

00078

1 fine on the range that they have. You know, whether the range is
2 still in good shape, mediocre shape or good shape, you know, I
3 can't really answer that, because that's still dependent on the
4 work that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing as far as
5 evaluating the vegetation that's available.

6
7 And I might also add that your question about movement
8 patterns, you know, bears directly on the study that's being done
9 with the satellite tracking collars. The purpose -- one of the
10 main purposes of putting these satellite collars on these animals
11 is to see, you know, on a weekly basis where they spend their
12 time, and if they have changed their migration patterns, and if
13 there is some movement between this herd and the Northern
14 Peninsula herd, because that -- movement between herds can also
15 explain population increases and population declines, but they
16 aren't easy to document unless you have collared animals. And
17 that's one of the purposes for putting these collar -- these
18 satellite collars on the animals.

19
20 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess when I look at that scenario as
21 well, when the caribou are in their migration patterns, you --
22 they are most likely to be in bigger numbers per herd, but when
23 shot at, they break up, and they don't always all turn tail
24 together, to which then breaks them out into smaller herds. And
25 this is one thing that was identified that we did have a lot more
26 counts of smaller numbers of herds. So you see how I bring that
27 question in?

28
29 MR. MACHIDA: Sure. The other question that was asked
30 related to calf production. The question was, you know, the calf
31 production currently is in the 20s, 21, 22 percent. And the
32 question was what -- if this is the production, then how much
33 survived to the following year, and there wasn't an answer given
34 on how many of these calves are recruited in the population as
35 adults. And the figure of -- that you were given of 21, 22
36 percent, that's calf production as of the fall. See, in most
37 caribou population, most of the losses occur in the first month
38 of life. And this population as in other populations, the number
39 of calves per cows even during the first month of life, during
40 the calving season of June is normally really high. It's
41 normally 60 to 80 calves per 100 cows. I mean, that's normal for
42 any calf -- caribou population. And the figure that you're given
43 is the amount that has been lost over the summer, and what we're
44 looking at in the fall of 21 or 22 percent. And in the normal
45 caribou population, there's very little loss during the winter
46 months. It might drop to 18 or 19, and that's probably what will
47 happen, but most of the loss occurs during the first month of
48 life, so the figure that you were given is actually -- is really
49 close to the amount that are produced and recruited in the
50 population as adults. The number that are actually born is a lot

00079

1 higher than that. It's normally like 60 to 80 calves per 100
2 cows. Just clarification of data.

3

4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. Is there any other questions
5 on these issues?

6

7 MR. MACHIDA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8

9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Hearing none, thank you. And I believe
10 we were going to have somebody address the.....

11

12 MR. SCHWARZ: Mr. Chairman, my name is Lynn Schwarz, and
13 if you'd like, I can give you a stock status on the Buskin and
14 Mill Bay and Mission, if you'd like?

15

16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, I would as I have got many concerns
17 as to I have been a long-time subsistence fisherman right in the
18 Kodiak area, and I see a tremendous change, and the regulation
19 has not changed to accommodate the changes that are taking place
20 I feel.

21

22 MR. SCHWARZ: Okay. I'll go ahead and give you a status
23 report. Again, I am the sport fish biologist. My area is
24 Kodiak, the Alaska Peninsula and the Aleutians.

25

26 Most of the fishing effort in our area for sport fish
27 happens right on the Kodiak Road System, so we put a weir on the
28 Buskin River to count salmon, to make sure that we get enough
29 fish for escapement. Our average -- our minimum escapement goals
30 for sockeye on the Buskin are 8,000. It's 6,000 for coho, and
31 for pinks it can be anywhere from 60 to 120,000, depending on
32 whether it's an odd or even year. Last year we counted 14,000
33 sockeye through the weir, so we were 6,000 above on our minimum
34 escapement goal. On the cohos we counted 9,000 through the weir,
35 so we were above the 6,000 minimum. And we had a 135,000 pinks.

36

37 The average subsistence harvest on that system is about
38 5,000 sockeye and about 1500 coho. And basically you get a
39 permit, you fill it out and you turn it back in, so those are
40 just adding up the permits. The sport harvest estimate for those
41 same stocks is about 2,000 on the sockeye and about 3,000 on the
42 coho.

43

44 And again I work with sport fish, so we run the weir. If
45 we have a shortfall, what my reaction would be, would be to
46 restrict the sport fishery. Commercial Fisheries Division is in
47 charge of commercial fisheries and subsistence fisheries, so they
48 would take action on those fisheries. There really isn't a
49 directed commercial fishery in Chiniak Bay on sockeye, and most
50 years not on coho. It's mainly a pink fishery. When they fish

00080

1 for pinks, some years they do get coho, some coho, but it's not
2 a very big commercial fishery in Chiniak Bay, except for pink
3 salmon.

4
5 So that's pretty much a stock status on what happens with
6 the Buskin.

7
8 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I am aware that the stocks have been
9 holding, but I am concerned here with the conflict and the
10 subsistence user group. When I say that, there is nothing in the
11 regulation that says you must set your net from another person.
12 In other words, if I get up at 5:00 a.m. to go out and get me --
13 ensure me a good spot so I will have some production, there is
14 nothing I can do if someone else comes out at 8:00 and sets their
15 net ten feet in front of me. This has occurred this year in
16 great numbers, and has created a lot of bad feeling, that there
17 must be some way we can survive as social beings without this
18 kind of conflict. I know in any other kind of user gear we do
19 have regulation so that we do not have a conflict, that tries to
20 at least address it. But in the subsistence, it plainly states
21 there is no distance in which a net can be set from one another.
22 And as the population of Kodiak grows, Buskin is very close, it's
23 very accessible, and it's very productive, so therefore the user
24 group in the subsistence area has increased at least ten-fold by
25 my judgment from the past years.

26
27 So that's my concern there. I believe that is something,
28 a proposal, I don't know which would have to come from the
29 federal side as outside the markers is federal waters, but inside
30 the markers is state waters, so here again I running into kind of
31 a what next, Wally, situation. So that is my concern of the
32 harvest of the subsistence on the Buskin.

33
34 My other concern here is the State -- the position they
35 have taken with the rural priority, that it is unconstitutional
36 to give anybody a preference. I guess my question point blank is
37 why then do we have a sports fishing area only, such as we have
38 in Mill Bay and Mission Beach in Kodiak?

39
40 MR. SCHWARZ: I don't know why those sport fishing only
41 areas were created in front of Mill Bay and Mission. They go way
42 back. I came on board with sport fish in '90. Prior to that I
43 was out on the Peninsula, and prior to that I was up in the
44 Arctic. So I really don't know the reason why those were
45 established. And that's -- what I can do is research that a
46 little bit to see if I can find out what those reasons were and
47 then forward them on to the Staff here, or maybe even just give
48 them to you myself.

49
50 As far aa the stock status on those two areas, Mill Bay

00081

1 and Mission Beach, basically there are very insignificant salmon
2 populations in those two areas. There's no spawning gravel
3 hardly, and -- but they do have a place where fish can rear, and
4 so what I do is in a couple weeks I'll go into the Buskin and
5 seine up a bunch of cohos, and we'll take their eggs, and at that
6 point I give them to the Kodiak Regional Aquaculture Association
7 at Piller Creek, and they raise them free of charge for the
8 community. And we stock those when they hatch out into Island
9 Lake, Dark Lake, Beaver Lake, and that will bring a return back
10 to Mill Bay. And we also put them in Mission Lake, which -- and
11 Potato Patch Lake, which brings those fish back. And that's
12 really what provides the fish that return there is that stocking
13 program.

14
15 We used to have real good returns of cohos there, and
16 that's when we used to let them go when they weighed about one
17 and a half grams. But the Aquaculture Association there on
18 Piller Creek is mainly a sockeye facility, and they don't have
19 any room to rear those cohos, so right now we're letting them go
20 at about .4 grams, and they just don't make it. So for the last
21 two years we've had real poor returns to those two beaches,
22 basically almost blank. And we're meeting with the Aquaculture
23 Association to see if we can remedy that, if we could get some
24 more water to provide some more raceways, then you could grow the
25 fish to a bigger size and let them go, and you'd probably see the
26 large returns.

27
28 But that gives you a run-down of what's happening there
29 for Mill Bay and Mission, and the size of those salmon returns.

30
31 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I certainly am aware of what you have
32 just explained, but I am also aware that we have many fish that
33 come in there that aren't domiciled, but yet we are not allowed
34 to participate in that harvest, irregardless. So I don't see it
35 as a shortage, and if it was a shortage, then I think sport
36 fishing is supposed to be discontinued before the subsistence.
37 So at any rate, it's just a system and a regulation that is not
38 consistent. Therefore I would like to work on it to find some
39 medium grounds. As a young person, those were our places to
40 which subsistence practices were utilized until they slowly
41 squeezed them out to sport fishing only. So, yes, I'm very
42 interested on how we can have sport fishing areas only.

43
44 Is there any questions here? Yes, Ivan?

45
46 MR. LUKIN: Yeah, my question is do you have anything to
47 do with the Crescent Lake planting of coho and red salmon in the
48 spring?

49
50 MR. SCHWARZ: No, that's the Aquaculture Association is

00082

1 doing that. I sit on the regional planning team in a capacity of
2 sport fish, but I really don't. That would be, you know, Larry
3 Malloy and he works pretty closely with the commercial fish
4 biologists because it's mainly intended for commercial harvest.

5
6 MR. LUKIN: All right. Thank you.

7
8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Do you know if those coho are being the
9 same as what they are in the lakes in Kodiak then? Probably all
10 the coho are being released at the same time, so that's probably
11 a reason why like Port Lions doesn't have the return it had a
12 couple of years ago?

13
14 MR. SCHWARZ: Mr. Chairman. No, those coho that they're
15 putting in Crescent Lake, they're coming from Afognak. They're
16 coming Katoi Bay, so if you.....

17
18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Okay.

19
20 MR. SCHWARZ:and that -- when we used to get them
21 from Katoi Bay, they were big, and so Katoi Bay's been doing very
22 good with their cohos as far as Katoi Bay. I mean, they're
23 saying that they're producing 100,000 cohos back at Katoi, and
24 I'm not sure what's happening into Port Lions.

25
26 MR. SQUARTSOFF: It's a big decline the last two years.

27
28 MR. SCHWARZ: Is that right? Yeah. It's not because
29 they're releasing them at a small size. That's a problem that's
30 unique to the road system, because we're -- we were told by the
31 State geneticists that we have with the local stock. That's why
32 we've got to get the fish out of the Buskin, raise them there,
33 and put them right back in.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Do we have any other questions here for
36 Mr. Schwarz?

37
38 MR. SCHWARZ: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. Next we have here on our
41 agenda is the Joint Chairs meeting of May 3rd, 1998.
42 Unfortunately I do not have any documentation with me here, as I
43 left very rapidly trying to make this meeting, hoping to make it
44 here today, as other business concerns were potential conflict.

45
46 However, I would like to say that again this year the
47 Joint Chairs, to highlight the areas of concern were, number one,
48 with the possible Federal takeover of the fisheries which would,
49 in fact, create a heavier work load for those of us who do
50 participate on these Councils, that compensation was one issue

00083

1 that we feel that we have put our best forward and not saying we
2 won't, but we feel that we are as equal as any State of Federal
3 employee that -- why should we continue here on this status
4 without compensation. Certainly at this time as everybody knows
5 we always cry budgets, but at any rate at this point it's at a
6 stalemate or a net loss, if you will. They have not come back to
7 us and addressed or have not even considered at this point any
8 other compensation for the services provided by our Councils.

9
10 The other issue was the Board's structure that we have
11 looked at what it requires to be an advisory Council member, that
12 we must be knowledgeable of the resources and their uses to live
13 in the rural communities, but this is not applicable to the Board
14 members. And we felt we were on losing grounds, that we needed
15 somebody in the Board mixture that had some of this knowledge,
16 local knowledge, as well and could be understood, that we weren't
17 trying to make exceptions but to lay it out on the table. At any
18 rate, the response back was to be a Board member you must be a
19 Federal employee and we are not Federal employees, therefore,
20 there was to be no change.

21
22 However, I feel, once again, this will be addressed to,
23 hopefully, try to find a solution that's going to help us address
24 and verify our legitimacy, that we are here as well for the
25 resource as we are for the user groups.

26
27 Those are the two major issues that stand out in my mind.
28 Maybe Taylor can help me out a bit, if you will, please.

29
30 MR. BRELSFORD: Taylor Brelsford. I do recall a third
31 item that was addressed at some length, and that had to do with
32 the importance of training, like bringing Council members fully
33 up to speed technically and in terms of the legal background and
34 so on so that you could intervene effectively before the Federal
35 Subsistence Board. And one specific guidance to us from Mitch
36 was to prepare a videotape, a training video, that would be kind
37 of a stand alone, something you could have at the house to go
38 through and kind of get a little more depth of background in over
39 to serve in your capacity as a Council member. And they were
40 really saying that when the fisheries thing comes on there's
41 going to be complexities in this new responsibilities for the
42 Council members and that will be the point at which putting some
43 money, some resources into the development of a training video
44 would be really important. So that was a commitment from Mitch
45 to our director, to Tom Boyd, and I think we consider that a
46 standing responsibility that will come into play with the
47 fisheries -- with the expansion of fisheries responsibilities at
48 some future time.

49
50 If I may, Mark, I would like to add a few words on the

00084

1 question of compensation 'cause I think some of the new members
2 may not have quite understood that this was actually a formal
3 request on the part of the Board itself. The Federal Subsistence
4 Board submitted a letter to Secretary Babbitt requesting
5 compensation for Council members, advocating compensation for the
6 Regional Council members. And Mitch, the chair of the Federal
7 Subsistence Board wrote a second letter advocating in stronger
8 terms, making the case that some Council members leave paid
9 employment, give up seasonal employment opportunities, limited
10 employment opportunities in the villages in order to serve on the
11 Council. That's a significant hardship in regions where
12 employment is irregular. And Mitch went to bat pretty hard. So
13 two letters actually went all the way to the Secretary.

14
15 And in about just in the week or two before the Board
16 meeting in May Secretary Babbitt actually replied in writing to
17 deny the request. And his grounds were two. One that it was --
18 that the Department of Interior funds advisory programs across
19 the country and he felt like it would be a precedent they could
20 not live with or apply equally to all other council advisory
21 programs to provide compensation here, but not do the same for
22 the other advisory bodies around the country. So on the question
23 of precedent he felt he could not agree to the request.

24
25 And he went on in the next couple of paragraphs
26 to say that he felt like the spirit of volunteer service is an
27 important component of being involved, that there's a difference
28 between professionals and volunteers. And that volunteer
29 opportunities have to come from the good will of citizens. That
30 we have to have a structure in which citizens get involved out of
31 their motivation, their sincere motivation, to volunteer and
32 contribute. And he was concerned that to take away the volunteer
33 quality of the Regional Councils would be negative over the long-
34 term. So I think at this point the way I would say it is that
35 the Council chairs were not persuaded, that they signaled their
36 intention to ask again to raise this question up again. And we
37 expect another letter to be prepared. Bill Thomas was asked to
38 kind of take the lead on that among the Regional Council chairs.
39 So I think the important part for the Council members at this
40 point is that it has gone all the way up the flag pole to Babbitt
41 himself. The answer at that time was no. The Council chairs
42 have indicated that they intend to continue to pursue it. And we
43 will keep you briefed on any ongoing developments about that at
44 later time.

45 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So I guess he is back to voluntary
46 actions. Certainly I know Mr. Babbitt has shown us his voluntary
47 action to disregard, but to go into private negotiations with
48 others over the issue.

49
50 At any rate, Taylor has given it to us as it is, whether

00085

1 we like it or not. And where we go from here, I guess, is up to
2 us.

3
4 Anyway, on that issue I just want to ask you at this
5 point here if you could go ahead and while you're here, Taylor,
6 give us an update on 15 Federal Subsistence Fisheries Management
7 update.

8
9 MR. BRELSFORD: Okay. If we're ready to go on to the
10 next agenda item, Mr. Chairman, I'm happy to do that.

11
12 I'd like to begin kind of with the most recent news, what
13 was saw in the newspapers this morning, and then some of the
14 presentation, I think the time is a bit late so I'm going to try
15 and focus and be quick, and really respond to questions, see how
16 far you want to go into the details of this at this point. But
17 there is a handout. The body of it has some bulleted items.
18 This was a handout at the table. It's not actually bound in the
19 booklets. And I also have some copies of the map that would show
20 the waters affected by the Katie John decision. I want to make
21 sure you have that available to you.

22
23 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess my question is do you know,
24 does anybody know yet what transpired in these closed door
25 negotiations which persuaded Mr. Babbitt to grant another year?

26
27 MR. BRELSFORD: We have essentially the same information
28 that the newspapers had an reported on this morning, so
29 specifically what was issued in Washington yesterday was a press
30 release by Secretary Babbitt indicating that he would not
31 recommend a veto. He would go along with a proposal by the
32 Alaska delegation to extend the moratorium, to have another
33 year's delay. So Babbitt's statements as reluctantly I will not
34 recommend a veto to the President on this item, I will not object
35 to the Alaska delegations' plan.

36
37 The statement by Senator Stevens, which was issued
38 yesterday was a bit more specific about what the content of that
39 plan is, but none of us have seen the actual language at this
40 point that would go in legislation. And it is at this point
41 still a proposal. They were supposed to be deliberating on this
42 as part of the appropriations bill today. And as of this
43 afternoon I'm not aware of any final action on it. I do want to
44 emphasize that it seems to be very probable that this will
45 happen, but the final action had not been taken as of yesterday
46 afternoon. And we didn't have any updated information late
47 today. So let me talk about what we understand the plan, the
48 Senator Stevens' plan to say. But we'll have to watch for final
49 action by the Congress, and then we'll have to look at the
50 specific language in the bill.

1
2 There were three steps, three parts, to Senator Stevens'
3 plan, and this is actually with Senator Murkowski and Senator
4 Young, but the Alaska delegation plan, the first part of this
5 they're characterizing as a phased in Federal takeover. So the
6 rule making or the Federal regulations for fisheries -- and we've
7 been working in this in several stages for two years now with the
8 Councils. That final rule, that set of regulations would
9 actually continue and be published in -- after December 1st. We
10 think it will come out in the Federal Register in January of '99.
11 So, what that means is the regulatory structure would be in
12 place. This moratorium permits publication of the final
13 regulations after December of '98. That's the first point.

14
15 However, it extends the moratorium on implementing those
16 regulations on the fishing grounds for another year. So from now
17 until October there would be no change on the ground. There
18 would be a legal structure on the shelf, so to speak, but the
19 fishing seasons in March, April, May, June, July would have no
20 change from the current situation. They would remain under State
21 jurisdiction on subsistence fisheries, and as we all know, there
22 was never -- State jurisdiction over commercial fisheries, sport
23 fisheries, that was not -- never under change, never proposed for
24 modification under the Katie John decision. So the rules go
25 ahead, but the implementation is blocked for another year. The
26 practical implementation on the ground is held up for another
27 year.

28
29 The second feature of this Stevens' plan of this proposal
30 is some funding. And there's a dollar figure of \$11 million
31 included in the proposal. It's in two steps. In June of 1999,
32 next year in June if the State Legislature has not taken further
33 action to provide citizens' vote on the Constitutional amendment,
34 if they continue to block action, then \$1 million is appropriated
35 to the Federal Subsistence program for -- to prepare for
36 implementation, to gather data and to prepare for law enforcement
37 purposes. That's \$1 million in June if the State took no
38 positive action.

39
40 The second -- the remaining money, the \$10 million is
41 available in September of next year, and if the State has taken
42 the appropriate action to come into compliance or to make moves
43 towards compliance with ANILCA, then the money goes to the State
44 in September of 1999. If the State has not taken that action
45 then that \$10 million would go to the Federal program to proceed
46 with on the ground implementation. This, then is kind of a stick
47 and carrot. It is the first time that specific funding has been
48 authorized by the Congress for implementation of the Federal
49 subsistence responsibilities, the fisheries responsibilities.
50 And Secretary Babbitt in his comment spoke at some length that

00087

1 he's still committed to the Federal protection of subsistence
2 fisheries and the forward progress in this current plan is in
3 establishing firm funding. But it's contingent, if the State
4 does positive things then the State receives that money -- if the
5 State Legislature, I mean to say, takes certain steps then that
6 money goes to the state. If the State Legislature does not take
7 action to put a ballot measure before the public, then 1 million
8 would come out of the Federal Government for implementation planning
9 in June. And then, the same question arises in September, and if
10 the State's done what's needed then the \$10 million goes to the
11 State at that time. And if they have not then the 10 million
12 comes to the Federal Government at that time.

13
14 The third component of Senator Stevens' plan -- and I'm
15 not sure I understand exactly what this means, so the fine print
16 is going to be a little key to me, but there were a number of
17 amendments adopted last year, amendments to ANILCA, under a deal
18 that was struck in the moratorium a year ago. And it included
19 definitions of rural areas. It had some impact on the Kenai
20 Peninsula, for example, and I remember there was a definition
21 about reasonable opportunity as part of the subsistence
22 protection. Those were changes in ANILCA that were controversial
23 within the Native community and elsewhere. And in the present
24 proposal those amendments a year ago would die. They would lapse
25 in December of 1999 and either be replaced by new language by the
26 State or by something else, but there is a sunset clause as part
27 of Senator Stevens' plan at this point so that these amendments
28 that were met with some controversy a year ago would go away and
29 nothing specific is said about whether there would be any other
30 changes instead.

31
32 So those are the three elements of the plan. It is not
33 yet enacted into legislation, although we're told it's pretty
34 probable, and we have not seen the exact language yet. We're not
35 able to provide you with the precise language as of this time.

36
37 So let me stop there and see if there's question or
38 comments, points of clarification. And.....

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I don't know.

41
42 MR. BRELSFORD:judge together whether you want to
43 go into more detail on the final rule.

44
45 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I don't know. To me it doesn't really
46 warrant any further of our time as we've never been a part of to
47 begin with. To me it's just plain and simple has how many times
48 has Congress reneged on their treaties. That stands loud in my
49 mind. Number one, what was the justification for it. I don't
50 think there's even hardly call -- Legislature being recalled

00088

1 twice and still not being able to come up with anything. That is
2 certainly not a justification. And certainly the surveys done
3 here in the State shows that the legislation is not mirroring the
4 people's wish anyway. So to me personally it doesn't carry any
5 weight, except the only thing it tells me is that election time
6 is coming. And I hope that people will voice exactly what they
7 feel during this election. But that's all I have to say, but I
8 would like to hear from any other Council members or public on
9 this issue.

10

11 MR. FOSTER: I've got a couple of questions on
12 clarification on some of this stuff. This is what I've been
13 thinking. What happens if the Legislature puts it before the
14 voters and the voters vote it down and the Federal Government
15 takes over?

16

17 MR. BRELSFORD: Ultimately that would be right. The
18 ANILCA unless it's overthrown says that the Federal Government
19 will protect subsistence harvest, the rural subsistence priority
20 on the Federal public lands. And the Katie John decision, the
21 legal decision says all of this about fisheries, says that
22 certain waters and subsistence fisheries on those Federal waters
23 are entitled to the same protection by the Federal Government
24 when the State is out of compliance. So that legislation, ANILCA
25 remains good law. The Court's decision, it was final on that
26 question. It was by the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court
27 let in stay in place. So what we have right now is a delay but
28 no reversal of the court decision nor of the Federal statute.
29 That delay has been agreed to by the Congress in order to allow
30 negotiations, compromises, an effort in the State Legislature to
31 get back in compliance with ANILCA and re-unify subsistence
32 management on all of the lands in one unified subsistence
33 protection regime.

34 If the Legislature doesn't step forward and make that
35 possible, then certain things happen. If the Legislature permits
36 -- makes arrangement for the public vote and the public were down
37 the road to vote against it, then still the Federal protections
38 and the court decision would stay in place. And in the scenario,
39 we're speculating years out, but in the way that you said it, if
40 ultimately the State of Alaska is not able to provide a
41 subsistence protection consistent with ANILCA, then the separate
42 Federal subsistence program would continue.
43 So I think you had it right. We're having -- you know, none of
44 us are given crystal balls to predict exactly how the Legislature
45 is going to respond. And it's even more difficult to predict
46 precisely what the public vote will be.

47

48 We've been told a number of times that there have been
49 polls suggesting that the Alaska public, in fact, supports the
50 rural subsistence priority, but, you know, you have to be a

00089

1 little careful about taking a poll because it's not binding in
2 the way that a vote would be. But I just want to underscore that
3 until Congress reverses the legislation the statutory protection
4 remains in place and the court's decision interpreting the scope
5 of the Federal lands, the Federal jurisdictions to include land
6 and water, the court decision remains in place.

7

8 MR. FOSTER: Have you figured out how you're going to
9 manage it then?

10

11 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, that's.....

12

13 MR. FOSTER: You're going to have to have the ADF&G.

14

15 MR. BRELSFORD: Absolutely.

16

17 MR. FOSTER: Have you even talked with them or.....

18

19 MR. BRELSFORD: Sure. That's kind of into the fine
20 print. And there's maybe a big more detail here, but I'll
21 suggest a couple of key points, and then we'll go into as much
22 detail as you want.

23

24 The first purpose of these regulations, and they've gone
25 through a couple of steps of development, is to identify the
26 waters affected. So you'll see that, for the most part, they are
27 inland navigable waters or fresh water streams. And there are
28 only a few instances in which marine waters are affected.
29 Actually in the Kodiak/Aleutians area there are a number of
30 those, they're pre-Statehood areas, pre-Statehood withdrawals, so
31 Womens Bay is an example. And there's some areas in the Aleutian
32 Islands, Unalaska Island, Simeonof Island, there are some
33 specific cases that are marine waters, so that's a key question,
34 what waters are affected. And the details are available to you.

35

36 The second question is what are the harvest regulations
37 going to look like. And the management approach in the Federal
38 regs is to make the minimum changes possible and the minimum
39 changes necessary to use existing subsistence seasons and harvest
40 limits and reporting requirements so that there's minimum
41 disruption at the beginning of this change in jurisdictions.
42 Fisheries business, fisheries management is very complex. There
43 are very efficient user groups. A few days difference in an
44 opening one side or the other can make a huge impact. That is
45 very much recognized by the Federal Board, certainly vigorously
46 asserted by the State, by the Department of Fish and Game. So
47 the management structure, the regulations structure would be as
48 consistent with existing subsistence regulations as possible. So
49 from the standpoint of the legal framework that's kind of the
50 approach.

00090

1 Operationally how we would staff it or actually
2 manage.....

3
4 MR. FOSTER: I hope it would be as close together as you
5 could. I would hate to be out there commercial fishing and the
6 State says I can do this and the Federal Government says I can't
7 do this, and I'm sitting here and I can't figure out what to do.

8
9 MR. BRELSFORD: Well, remember that the State Government
10 would be the only party managing, the only manager of the
11 commercial fisheries. The Federal Government is not engaged in
12 direct management of commercial fisheries, nor of subsistence
13 fisheries anywhere -- nor of sport fisheries, I'm sorry. The
14 only instance in which the Federal Government would directly
15 manage a subsistence fisheries in these Federal waters, okay? So
16 there's spillover effects. We're talking about the same stocks
17 and the allocations have to be worked out in unison, but there
18 will be no Federal commercial fisheries regulations. There will
19 only be State commercial fisheries regs. I want to say that
20 again and again. It's only subsistence.....

21 MR. FOSTER: I got that. I got that.

22
23 MR. BRELSFORD: Okay.

24
25 MR. FOSTER: But if there's a subsistence problem then
26 it could possibly spill over?

27
28 MR. BRELSFORD: Right. It's possible that there would
29 need to be adjustments in other fisheries, commercial or sport.
30 That is true. And that's where the question of coordination
31 comes in.

32
33 And the thing I next wanted to turn to was the matter of
34 operational planning, how would you actually manage on the ground
35 with divided management with two managers working in the same
36 river systems. And on that point the State and Federal Boards --
37 or the Department of Fish and Game and the Board -- the Alaska
38 Board of Fisheries and the Federal Subsistence Board, they have
39 recognized the fact that you can't manage in a vacuum. And one
40 run, one reach of the river that it's the same stocks, they're
41 migratory stocks. They pass through and between managers
42 repeatedly on the Yukon River and repeatedly in most of the runs,
43 so there had been a planning group working for quite sometime on
44 coordination. And that effort has actually accelerated or risen
45 in profile recently.

46
47 The Chairs of the two State boards, the Commissioner,
48 several people from the Department of Fish and Game as well as
49 our entire board, entire Federal Subsistence Board met to set in
50 motion a more intensive coordination effort. And that was in the

00091

1 last week in September. They will meet again in November to
2 continue these discussions of common use, free use of the best
3 data possible so that both management systems are working on the
4 best possible scientific information. And then they're talking
5 a lot -- although I don't think we have the details sorted out on
6 this about the in-season management phase of fisheries
7 management. The Alaska Department of Fish and Game has a pretty
8 highly respected system of in-season management, operating
9 locally by emergency orders. The Federal regulations try to
10 create an equivalent responsive management structure on the
11 Federal system. That is to say some delegation down to local
12 managers, to refuse managers or park superintendents for quick
13 turn around in-season response to run strength, timing, all those
14 things that we know about.

15
16 The question about how those two guys are going to work -
17 - how those two managers are going to work together, and they're
18 not all men, how those two managers will work in concert during
19 the in-season period. That's still under discussion so.....

20
21 MR. FOSTER: Yeah. I'm used to working like the North
22 Pacific Fisheries Management Council. And it takes them forever
23 to change anything, forever. And especially with, you know, the
24 salmon fisheries and stuff, a lot of times, you know, you don't
25 have three years to study something before you make a change.
26 And it's just
27 -- well, maybe I'm asking how would this Board -- you're still
28 going to have the Board of Fish and you're going to have a Board
29 like this. How are they going to interact?

30
31 MR. BRELSFORD: I would say that the primary
32 responsibility of the Regional Councils is you will give advice
33 to the Federal Subsistence Board. And the key opportunity for
34 you and for the Federal Subsistence Board to identify and protect
35 a subsistence fisheries need is in the pre-season management plan
36 phase. You're familiar that there are management plans for
37 virtually all of the complex fisheries.....

38
39 MR. FOSTER: Uh-hum.

40
41 MR. BRELSFORD:and they identify an escapement.
42 They identify in river, sport, subsistence, other allocations,
43 and then they identify commercial allocations that typically
44 occur earlier in time and in salt water. Those are an effort to
45 respect the biology, identify and work within the biological
46 constraints, and then sort out the claims who gets what in
47 succession. Those pre-season management plans will be the
48 primary opportunity to identify the subsistence allocation that's
49 needed to protect the (indiscernible - cut out). So I would say
50 if you're wondering where you focus, what's the priority for you,

00092

1 for this Council, it's on pre-season management plan. Make sure
2 that the subsistence allocation historically coming into this
3 regulation is right. And if it's not we make the changes in that
4 pre-season allocation plan.

5
6 In-season I'm not able to really tell you how the in-
7 season management is going to work except to say that we're going
8 to try and maintain the strength and the responsiveness that
9 ADF&G has built up over the years. We can't have the Board
10 meeting for special action in a public meeting before a change is
11 made. That's unwieldy. It's cumbersome. It's not adequate for
12 the responsiveness.

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: We are going to run short of time here.
15 At any rate, I really do appreciate you sharing with us, but
16 still there is -- you say pre-season, wait a minute, I'm trying
17 to say why are we focusing on something like the salmon that's
18 still in abundance. I am looking at what we've already lost and
19 what we are about to lose. We are going to be put in, once
20 again, an uphill battle. Nothing different than the Izembek
21 Herd. When I say that, the abundance of the crabs, they are
22 gone. The abundance of the shrimp, they are gone. The sea lions
23 are almost on the endangered species. From subsistence? Let's
24 be real.

25
26 Yeah, I have a real problem with it. And I think it's
27 going to effect. And one species does affect the other species.
28 And we have a grave concern about the pollack stocks at this
29 point. When is it going to be too late for this uphill battle
30 again? And they're crying that the subsistence user is getting
31 out of focus. I disagree. We've already lost major stocks that
32 we cannot even have a pre-season allocation or harvest on because
33 they're gone. That's my view.

34
35 At any rate, I know we do have a lot more here before us
36 and I do hope to be out of here at 4:30 as we all, a lot of us
37 have other obligations.

38
39 MR. BRELSFORD: Let me close then by saying that we
40 talked about the immediate impact of the extended moratorium. No
41 change, no -- if this is adopted there would be no extension, no
42 change in jurisdiction in the fishing seasons next year. That,
43 I think, is pretty important.

44
45 The regulatory structural, the legal structure, will come
46 out early in the new year. And I want to invite you guys to pay
47 attention to it, not obsess with it because it's on the shelf.
48 It's not going into effect on the fisheries in January, but be
49 aware. Part of your ability to strategically offer suggestions
50 for improvement will come by looking at that regulatory

00093

1 structure. And I guess the -- I did want you to be aware of the
2 recognition and the assurance of our Board's serious commitment
3 to coordinated management, to using the best science to have a
4 responsive incident (ph). All these things about State
5 coordination are pretty fundamental and I didn't want those to go
6 without mention.

7
8 In a related vein, and then I'll quit, the Federal Board,
9 Secretary Babbitt, his assistant, Deborah Williams, Mitch
10 Demientieff, have also said that part of the Federal package when
11 it goes into effect will be cooperation with tribal entities and
12 with local communities. So there's a lot of focus. We've talked
13 primarily about cooperation and cooperative management with the
14 State. I want you to be aware and there's some further detail in
15 here under the last section, next steps, that there's also some
16 analysis going on about how to systematically involve tribes,
17 local people.

18
19 Ya'll are probably aware of various projects around the
20 state where the tribal associations and school kids are involved
21 in count towers and weirs and things of that sort, or community
22 studies, the subsistence harvest studies that have involved local
23 people. I think that -- I personally think that's been a pretty
24 important part of the wildlife program, you know, on the Federal
25 side. And I want to say that we're being told that's a basic, a
26 fundamental expectation as far as
27 the fisheries side of the program. So at some point we should
28 have something more concrete to offer to you about the tribal
29 partnerships, the inclusion of local people in the cooperative
30 management effort. And with that I think I'd better thank you
31 for your attention. And I offer to answer questions one on one,
32 phone us, you know, check in as these things unfold.

33
34 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Certainly. And I appreciate this,
35 Taylor, I really do, but in the meantime I'm not necessarily
36 meaning to kill the messenger when I say hoyo (ph). Thank you.

37
38 MR. BRELSFORD: Understood.

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Moving right along, I think Chief -- I
41 mean Cliff Edenshaw would like to carry us through 14, 16 and 19,
42 if you will, please, Cliff.

43
44 MR. EDENSHAW: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you refer to
45 under number 14 Tab E, this is in regards to changes in c&t and
46 changes in seasons and bag limits from last year's proposals.
47 Last year or this past year the Kodiak/Aleutians had four
48 proposals. They had one RFR that was submitted by the State
49 regarding elk. And there was one proposal that was deferred,
50 which was Proposal 41 regarding brown bear. There was an

00094

1 overlapping proposal from Bristol Bay. And Rachel stated earlier
2 this morning that that will be taken care of for the upcoming
3 meeting in, is that March, April.

4
5 And all the proposals that the Council put forth were
6 approved unanimously by the Board. If you look under Tab E,
7 Proposal 41 which is the black tail deer season in Unit 8 and the
8 seasons were extended from August 1st until January 31st present.
9 In the past it was open until December 31st.

10
11 RFR 97-05 was rejected by the Board and that was
12 regarding elk, the c&t that the Council had put forth previously.

13
14
15 Proposal 42 was establishing an elk hunting season. And
16 that was passed unanimously. And that was from September 1st
17 until the 25th.

18
19 Proposal 43 was a proposal regarding a c&t use
20 determination for brown bear. That's the one I mentioned
21 previously, that was deferred until additional information is
22 collected from them. Rachel said she was going to talk with
23 Della and I forget who the other one was.

24
25 MS. MASON: Melvin.

26
27 MR. EDENSHAW: Melvin. And the other residents from the
28 region regarding use of brown bear out there.

29
30 Proposal 44 was revisiting c&t determinations for Unimak
31 Island. And presently -- at that time False Pass was the only
32 community listed for a positive c&t. And after the Board met in
33 May after a proposal was submitted, King Cove, Sand Point and --
34 both of those two were added to the c&t. And that was the action
35 that was taken by the Board at the past May's meeting.

36
37 If you go into Tab H, alternates, as you can see, this is
38 also tied to the charters. And the charters are renewed on even
39 number years and this being '98 the charter was signed off and
40 approved, but prior to '98 here the Council had been wrestling
41 with alternates because the Eastern Interior -- I believe it was
42 the Eastern Interior or Western Interior Council had requested
43 alternates. At one time they wanted a shadow council which was
44 alternates for each of the Council members. And the
45 Kodiak/Aleutians Council requested one alternate from the
46 Aleutians and one from Kodiak Island. And as a result of
47 deliberations from all the Regional Councils the Board went ahead
48 and accepted their proposal, which is to have one alternate from
49 Kodiak Island and one alternate from the Aleutian Chain. And
50 presently (Michael (indiscernible) is the alternate for the

00095

1 Aleutian Chain, and Ivan Lukin has been appointed as the
2 alternate for Kodiak Island.

3
4 And as I discussed earlier, in lieu of Irving Reft's
5 resignation from other Council and until that's been finalized,
6 as I stated earlier this morning, I sent a letter to Dale and he
7 has yet to respond back to me. And I'll likely submit another
8 one to him or call him and ask him to finalize that for us, but
9 he did call me in person and state that he wished to resign
10 because of some personal issues. And in lieu of that Ivan will -
11 - when the Council meets again in February or March or whenever
12 that's in the winter that we have in our calendar, providing --
13 he'll attend that meeting also.

14
15 And with the charter renewal regarding alternates, in the
16 case of Dale Reft it doesn't mean that Ivan is going to continue
17 to fill out Dale Reft's three year term. What will happen is
18 that in January nominations -- we normally open up the
19 nominations for the Council because I think in this upcoming
20 year, I believe if I looked at my roster for it, this past year
21 we had one, two, and three, we had three positions. And think
22 this upcoming year Vince's seat is going to be up for
23 reappointment and one other one. And at that time applications
24 are or nominations when it's opened, those will be taken in
25 consideration and Dale's seat will be filled for an appropriate
26 three year term. So that was regarding the charter.

27
28 And this being '98 starting after this -- you know,
29 during this meeting, as I said before, charters can be changed
30 and they're approved during even number years, so I won't have a
31 copy with me presently, but in previous meetings, in your other
32 booklet I had included copies of the charter. So between now
33 and, you know, '99 the Council may choose to submit, you know,
34 similar requests if they so desire to make any changes in the
35 charter. And those would be approved in even number years.

36
37 And the last item under 19, Tab J, was just a special
38 action request, and that was regarding the Southern Alaska
39 Peninsula Caribou hunt that was approved. We've gone over some
40 of that here this morning regarding surveys. And as Ray alluded
41 to, I know Della had concerns the last meeting we met about
42 survey results. And Ray is promising results here this afternoon
43 or was it this morning? Stated that there may be additional
44 permits issued based on survey results that were just recently
45 compiled. So we're await word from the refuge in regards to
46 additional permits coming from the refuge. And, I'm not sure,
47 Ray, is that going to be on Unimak Island or in 9(D). Unimak
48 Island is Unit 10. Would those additional permits come from Unit
49 10 or....

50

00096

1 MR. PORTWOOD: No, it'd be 9(D).

2

3 MR. EDENSHAW: 9(D). Yeah. Okay. So that will be in
4 9(D), the additional 50 permits. And I'm not sure, I can't
5 recall the exact allocation of how those will go between the
6 villages.

7

8 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Is there any questions here for Cliff?
9 Everybody awake? Thank you, Cliff, appreciate it.

10

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chairman, Daniel Boone here from
12 the Alaska Maritime Refuge and he wanted some air time regarding
13 caribou on Adak.

14

15 MR. BOONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for squeezing me in
16 here and I won't take long, I promise. I am Daniel Boone, for
17 the record, from Alaska Maritime National Wildlife Refuge. As
18 most of you know, caribou were introduced on Adak in the late
19 '50s and '60s and the herd grew. And they had a fairly
20 successful hunting program out there, and then about four years
21 ago the Navy decided they were going to leave, and we all go
22 pretty nervous about what was going to happen if there wasn't any
23 harvest or predators on the caribou. We were talking about
24 removing them, taking them off life, you know, harvesting them
25 and distributing the meat, a number of different scenarios were
26 discussed. Nothing was ever done.

27

28 In the meantime, the Navy and the Aleut Corporation and
29 the Fish and Wildlife Service have been in negotiations regarding
30 re-use on Adak. And currently we're fairly optimistic and
31 hopeful that there's going to be some viable long-term re-use out
32 there. If that occurs then, you know, the issue about trying to
33 take the caribou off becomes moot because there will be a
34 community there to utilize them. You know, in the meantime we've
35 gone to ADF&G and asked them and they have done this, there's no
36 bag limit and no season on caribou on Adak right now.

37

38 We got in a survey this summer, not a very good one, but
39 nonetheless, it's the best we've had in seven or eight years. It
40 looks like the population there now is about 850 to 900,
41 somewhere in that vicinity. That's less than we had expected
42 from our last

43 -- our earlier surveys in the early '90s and our projections out
44 to where we are now. We thought it would probably be up around
45 13 or 1,400 so, somewhere in there we made a mistake. I can't
46 tell you where it is, but at any rate, right now it looks like,
47 you know, we're not in the mode of trying to remove caribou from
48 Adak. And, you know, that's where the issue of well, if we were
49 going to take them off couldn't some of them go to Deer and Unga
50 Island near King Cove and Sand Point. So that's kind of where we

00097

1 are right now. It just doesn't like we're going to do anything
2 with them at the present time.

3
4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes. I wished Vince was here as he's
5 probably the most up to date with the issues regarding that, and
6 I know he did have some input, but without him here I don't know
7 what he had in mind. But you say you are not in the removal
8 mode, but you also are not in the management mode either. So in
9 other words, if the herd diminished down to 100 we don't care is
10 the attitude, you know, for lack of a better term.

11
12 MR. BOONE: Well, that's a pretty remote possibility.
13 It's still increasing so, you know, looking at it -- I mean
14 certainly if the population out there got to the size that they
15 started to -- the herd started to diminish from harvest, we'd
16 like to maintain a population out there of about 250 to 400,
17 somewhere in there. And so when it got in that range then we'd
18 probably implement some tighter control, but you know, for the
19 foreseeable future.....

20
21 I was over and talked with the Alaska Department of Fish
22 and Game this morning and for the foreseeable future we don't
23 think there will be any recommended changes.

24
25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: No translocations or anything else?

26
27 MR. BOONE: No, we're not looking at any
28 translocations.....

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

31
32 MR. BOONE:or, you know, reducing the hunting
33 season or anything at the present time.

34
35 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So how is the range doing out there, do
36 you have any idea?

37
38 MR. BOONE: That's a good question. No, I don't really
39 hav a very good idea.

40
41 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So.....

42
43 MR. BOONE: I think that, you know, from talking to
44 botanists that were out there several years ago they could see
45 some use, they could see where there was use, but they weren't
46 saying that it was over-used at that point. Certainly, you know,
47 or three or four years down the road, the herd is a little
48 bigger, but that's a big island. And I don't think that the
49 habitat has been dramatically damaged at this point.

50

00098

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So by saying there's no change we can
2 safely feel that there's not going to be another Hagemeister on
3 our hands.

4
5 MR. BOONE: I don't think so. Not in the near future,
6 no. No, I don't think that's in the -- that's not in the
7 planning at all.

8
9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Does anybody have any questions here for
10 Mr. Boone.

11
12 MR. BOONE: Okay.

13
14 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you.

15
16 MR. BOONE: Thank you.

17
18 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Short and sweet.

19
20 MR. BOONE: Yep.

21
22 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess we need to hear something on
23 migratory birds here before our manager gives up on us. Please
24 Rod.

25
26 MR. KING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Rod King, U.S. Fish
27 and Wildlife Service, Division of Migratory Birds. I'm from
28 Fairbanks. I guess I can just refer you to, I believe it's Tab
29 I. And I'll put on my seeing things here. Basically I'm the
30 person that's responsible for the counts for several species of
31 migratory birds throughout the state. I have done every emperor
32 goose survey since they were initiated.

33
34 A little bit about how we do the survey, maybe
35 enlightening to you as, you know, you have an opportunity to look
36 at some of the sheets in the tab there.

37
38 Our goal in the management plan is to get a good a count
39 as we can for a total population estimate in spring. That number
40 is the number that's used in the management for emperor geese.
41 Our efforts are to pick that time frame at which emperor geese
42 have not arrived on the Yukon Delta National Wildlife Refuge
43 where a major portion of the population breeds, nor is there
44 habitat basically available for them anywhere else. That is that
45 the habitat is still snow covered and/or iced over.

46
47 In the light, we also try to pick a time frame when we
48 feel that all or as near as we can all of the emperor geese are
49 out of the Aleutian Islands. Our basic area of survey then is to
50 start in Bethel. We fly the Yukon Delta shoreline, which is by

00099

1 then some years open, some years scattered ice. And we fly every
2 estuary and every shoreline mile to Unimak Island. Some years we
3 fly on around Unimak Island. And a couple of years we even went
4 as far as Umiak out in Nikolski. So after the north side of the
5 peninsula is done, that is probably where 90 percent of the
6 emperor stage. Once we've done the north side of the peninsula
7 we fly the south side of the Alaska Peninsula back to
8 approximately just east of Becharof Lake. So we feel like we've
9 covered except for the Aleutian Islands 100 percent of the
10 habitat that emperor geese would be using.

11
12 If you look at the first tab there, one of the situations
13 that we have with emperor geese is that in Alaska, really in the
14 world basically emperor geese are the only species of goose that
15 spend their entire life in or near Alaska. We have some records
16 of a fair -- we don't have good estimates, but we know that birds
17 cross the Straits and use part of Russia for breeding, but for
18 wintering there's no other goose species that stays in the same
19 area to winter. And as far as we know, 100 percent of emperor
20 geese stay in Alaska for the winter. Every once in awhile we
21 have an occasional bird that gets mixed up with the white front
22 brood and shows up in Skagit Bay or Washington somewhere, but --
23 and an occasional sighting in Japan. Other than that Alaska has
24 to support the wintering population.

25
26 After we do the spring survey that number is used to --
27 in a three year -- what we call a three year average to determine
28 the estimate and management number. Historically there were very
29 few counts of emperor geese. What information we do have is that
30 they were well over 150,000 approximately, in that range. When
31 we started the counts we had some counts that were in the 100,000
32 range. And so we know that basically the birds have declined.
33 There are several reasons for this, several concerns, and we
34 don't profess to know all the answers. We do have some
35 information that it appears that possibly the -- since the season
36 was closed for all sport hunting and basically legal subsistence
37 hunting, wintering areas seem to take the toll on the young
38 birds. Birds, in general, to have a very high mortality rate in
39 young birds, younger than a year. And emperor geese, I think,
40 are probably one of the most susceptible in the fact of the area
41 where they winter.

42
43 I think part of -- irregardless of what our counts are,
44 like I said, I'm the person who does the counts. I think where
45 part of the confusion has been is over the numbers and why we
46 can't hunt emperors is probably because we also do a fall
47 productivity survey. And that number is always higher except for
48 about one year, I think, who knows what happened in the counts,
49 but that number includes the young of the year. But that number
50 is not used in our management criteria. That number is used in

000100

1 conjunction with a photography survey, photos flocks of emperors
2 to get an estimate of young. And in the fall, September, the
3 young can be distinguished from the adults by their grey head as
4 probably all of you know. So that's where that number is used,
5 but the real management number and the one that we have to decide
6 has the most impact and influence on emperor geese is the spring
7 population number. Once that number fell below 60,000 three year
8 average, then the management plan was that the population must
9 reach 80,000 three year average to be open to sport hunting or
10 general hunting again.

11
12 Right now you can see that one chart does not have this
13 spring's, which is about 38,000 birds. So we do not have an
14 increase there. I can tell you that on the fall survey, the next
15 page, before -- it's not numbered here, but it's the emperor
16 goose fall population, we just finished the fall survey. And we
17 have approximately 68,000 birds estimate.

18
19 One thing I would like --.....

20
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 68 or 86?

22
23 MR. KING: Pardon me.

24
25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 68 or 86?

26
27 MR. KING: 68 for 1998. It's not on that chart.....

28
29 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

30
31 MR. KING: For this year. Yeah, this fall. One thing
32 you might be interested, I did have a few overheads, but in the
33 interest of time, over the last 15 years approximately 90 percent
34 of the birds we find are on the north side of the Alaska
35 Peninsula. Of those about a third are found in the Nelson
36 Lagoon, Port Moller area. And another, you know, real high
37 significant portion of the total population is found in the Seal
38 Islands and Port Heiden. That's about 75 percent of all the
39 birds are in those three areas. So you can see how important
40 those estuaries are to the emperor geese. When you consider the
41 amount of habitat available to the birds, probably the Seal
42 Islands probably have the highest number of birds per square
43 kilometer of habitat, both spring and fall. Cinder Lagoon is
44 another very important area.

45
46 This year on average we had been finding about 25,000
47 birds in Nelson Lagoon and Port Moller. This year there was
48 about 17,000. So that shows you where the population is at over
49 the long-term or as far as use of those areas.

50

000101

1 One thing I can tell you is that we have tried to -- in
2 our surveys we tried to choose a situation that gives us the same
3 conditions year after year. I cannot say that we have counted
4 every bird in existence every spring. It's just virtually
5 impossible to do, but we try to do under the same habitat
6 conditions, same climate conditions, weather patterns, we try to
7 do a survey at the same time of year which gives us the best
8 estimate. When I was mentioning earlier prior to this discussion
9 about stellar eiders that survey or those types of surveys,
10 nesting surveys, are transects, we sample an area and then we
11 estimate the number of birds we see. This population estimate is
12 what we call a total count. We fly all available habitat that we
13 can find and count the number of birds. It still basically comes
14 down to what I think is an index. We feel that we count a very,
15 very high percent of the birds but it's still an index. It's not
16 an exact science.

17
18 Wildlife management is tough but especially tough are
19 emperor geese. And the reason that emperor geese are -- one of
20 the reasons that they're tough is that it's very, very difficult
21 to get a total population count during a migration. If we could
22 get, for example, in winter when we feel the birds are very
23 sedentary, they're not moving at all, and we could fly all the
24 way out to Attu Island, all the way to the end of the Aleutians,
25 then we could probably get a better estimate. That's virtually
26 impossible. We've tried, we've used twin-engine aircrafts to try
27 to do that a couple of times. It's -- the limiting factors are
28 visibility, of course as you know weather, a lot of other things.
29 Yes, sir.

30
31 MR. LUKIN: Back to work on the island of Shemya.....

32
33 MR. KING: Uh-hum.

34
35 MR. LUKIN:and in the winter months and they were
36 quite plentiful out there on the rocks and little pools.

37
38 MR. KING: There's definitely use in those areas. I have
39 flown three surveys in the winter, again, King Salmon to Unimak
40 Island documented similar uses of bays that we saw in the fall
41 and spring. But we also flew at a time, in one instance, where
42 there had been very cold weather about three weeks prior, and we
43 saw at least a 50 percent decrease. And I think that the birds
44 prefer, they will stay in the estuaries of the Alaska Peninsula
45 if the weather permits them. If the weather gets cold enough and
46 the flats start freezing, and you folks who live in some of those
47 areas can probably see this, then that's when I think the birds
48 move to the Aleutian Islands and stay. When you consider the
49 difference of habitat available to the birds in the Aleutian
50 Islands as compared to these large estuaries on the Alaska

000102

1 Peninsula, I believe that's when the birds suffer a lot of
2 mortality. And we have no control over that. And it's very
3 difficult to assess and to document. And so that's some of the
4 problems that we have in the management plan.

5
6 I do feel that the 80,000 number is probably in the best
7 interest of emperor geese. I think that if we can look at the
8 resource and whatever that number is, we, the management people
9 who devised this plan, I just gave them the information, someone
10 else devised and selected that number. But that was approximately
11 a number which would ensure continuation of increase in emperor
12 geese. And so that's where the 80,000 number came from. It can
13 be debated. You folks have the opportunity to make
14 recommendations of subsistence take in your areas. The Migratory
15 Bird Treaty Act amendment for hunting and take between 10th of
16 March and September 1 has been ratified and approved. And so the
17 Fish and Wildlife Service is now in the situation of implementing
18 regulations for subsistence take. It's going to take at least
19 another year for those to be in effect, but I feel like that
20 there is, you know, that opportunity for you in certain areas.

21
22 One last thing I would like to point out is that we do
23 have another survey in the spring on the Yukon Delta. It's
24 called our nesting survey. That survey has documented some
25 slight increase in breeding pairs, but total population seems to
26 be stable or slightly down. But when you consider that we can
27 only account for about half of the total population of emperors
28 on the Yukon Delta. The other half are somewhere else. And the
29 only other somewhere else that I can guess, we've done some
30 cursory surveys in Russia, some of the forelands that are in some
31 of the Russian habitat. And what happens in Russia as far as
32 productivity and whatever take there is there we don't have any
33 control of and it's hard to estimate how the birds end up that
34 fall because we're only looking at probably half the birds on the
35 Yukon Delta.

36
37 MR. GUNDERSON: I noticed more and more pairs have been
38 staying down on the Alaska Peninsula and nesting, too, in the
39 last -- probably in the last 10 years.

40
41 MR. KING: Uh-hum.

42
43 MR. GUNDERSON: They're basically around all year round.
44 And as you pointed out earlier, the severity of the winters has
45 been taking the biggest toll on them in the last number of years.
46 They will not leave the area until every puddle is froze up
47 before they move out into the Aleutians. And the feed that they
48 get out, the seaweed and whatever's available, mussels and
49 whatever, just doesn't seem to sustain their health once they
50 leave there. Once they come back, whenever we get a warm spell

000103

1 and one of those bays open up they're back within a day or two.
2 And they're in real poor health. And then it's a real high
3 mortality rate especially the yearlings. The ones that have made
4 it as long as two to three years has got a lot better chance of
5 survival than the first year bird.

6
7 MR. KING: That seems to be what some of the studies have
8 indicated also. Again, the Aleutians Islands are tough. We
9 haven't been able to get a substantial study going on in the
10 Aleutian Islands to find out what's happening with those birds,
11 but it's just a harsh environment, nobody wants to go there, no,
12 I don't know. It's difficult.....

13
14 MR. GUNDERSON: Yeah, if could find somebody go out there
15 and count them.....

16
17 MR. KING:and -- yeah, our funding priorities have
18 been to try to work on the productivity and to find out things we
19 can manage. That part of it we can't manage. We don't know how
20 to do anything about the winter mortality. And it's a difficult
21 pill to swallow.

22
23 MR. CRATTY: I'd just like to say you've got a season
24 going in for spring hunting and the summer hunt. We hunt the
25 birds in a different time. I'm sure that you at King Cove and
26 Sand Point, you hunt them in the fall. So.....

27
28 MR. KING: That's one of our, you know, difficulties has
29 been spring subsistence harvest in the Yukon Delta area, although
30 there's a Yukon Delta Management Plan for every goose species.
31 The emperors have always been difficult because what happens is
32 that basically from our observations is that the breeding pairs
33 are staged on the Alaska Peninsula and they're ready to go. As
34 soon as the Yukon Delta opens up they're the first ones to arrive
35 and they want to set up housekeeping and territories, and they're
36 also the first ones then that people want -- you know, they want
37 that fresh meat. And it's very tempting. And so there is some
38 take there, but it happens to end up being those pairs that are
39 all ready to nest. And so when you take those pairs or one of
40 them then you destroy that opportunity for reproduction for that
41 whole year. And so it's a difficult species to manage. And it's
42 -- you know, when the birds are there you think that you should
43 be able to have some of them. And so everyone has to work
44 together to try to help these birds out.

45
46 MR. CRATTY: So it wouldn't be a problem for us to hunt
47 them in the fall than to have a subsistence hunt, if we push for
48 it.....

49
50 MR. KING: I'd just say that I think you have the

000104

1 opportunity to make recommendations to the Game Board that might
2 have some take in some areas like, I guess, I probably wouldn't
3 recommend any take in Ivanof Bay even though every time we fly it
4 there's a nice three to four or 500 birds there. They're always
5 there, but still I suspect it's the same birds every year. And
6 if you start harvesting birds then you start losing that part of
7 the segment of the population that may be somewhere else. But
8 there is opportunity -- and the reason that I say that maybe in
9 the fall subsistence hunt, something like that, is because
10 there's a certain number of young that are going to die. We know
11 that. There's a high percentage of young birds that are going to
12 die every year. That's the way birds are. And if we were going
13 to have any type of harvest on them that would be the time of the
14 year that I think the birds could probably most sustain it. But
15 the spring harvest is probably the most detrimental time of year.
16 Yes, sir?

17
18 MR. GUNDERSON: The harvestable birds ought to be the
19 first and second year birds, don't take any of the third year
20 birds and that will you will always have a continuation, a bird
21 that's learned its way and everything else. And they're are
22 definite markings. You can tell the age group of the bird by
23 their markings.

24
25 MR. KING: That's correct.

26
27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'm just trying to see what conclusion
28 we have here with the spring count and the winter count here from
29 '81 to '97. Why such a difference? As you had mentioned during
30 their migration they're much harder to count. Other than that,
31 if I look at the graph it seems to me it's pretty darn consistent
32 on the winter count, whereas the spring count goes like this. I
33 don't know what conclusion we're reaching with this?

34
35 MR. KING: Well.....

36
37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: When you say a three year population, to
38 me it looks like in 16 years you hardly get a better, steady
39 count of birds. Or I guess the better way to put it is what is
40 the maximum number that the environment is going to sustain, do
41 we know this? I don't know. I'm just trying to figure out, it
42 looks to me like the winter count is might say about an 80,000
43 average for 16 years. It doesn't seem to me that there is any
44 indication of harm.

45
46 MR. KING: Like I said before, the only difference really
47 is the fact that the fall count includes all that year's young.
48 And I think what happens is -- and right now I'm starting to with
49 our computer technology I'm starting to pick out climate
50 summaries, monthly temperature and minimum temperatures for

000105

1 winter in like Adak, Cold Bay, King Salmon, Port Heiden, and
2 we're going to try to plot this with some of our decreases in the
3 spring. And I believe that we can probably plot those decreases
4 with low temperatures in winter. And that's why I think that you
5 see a higher -- or more fluctuation in spring because it's really
6 dependent on what happens in the winter to those young birds.
7 And that's a significant part of the population. It can vary
8 from anywhere from 30, last year it was only 11 percent, but it
9 can vary to 30 percent of the population is young birds. So I
10 think that's been -- when it comes spring after a harsh winter
11 that's when you see this real dip in the population.

12
13 The reason that I say migration counts, any time you try
14 to do migration counts it's pretty difficult to get total counts.

15
16 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But then it shows in the fall that it's
17 pretty stable.

18
19 MR. KING: Right.

20
21 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I mean, you know, if you take a big dip
22 in the spring and then in the fall it bounces right back.....

23
24 MR. KING: Right. And that's the influence of
25 production.

26
27 MR. FOSTER: Can the Russians perform a little better
28 than AOIK can perform it?

29
30 MR. KING: That's why I say. We don't know. Half of the
31 birds we don't know what happens in their spring, their summer,
32 the breeding conditions, wherever that may be. We can't account
33 for half of the birds and that definitely has some impact on
34 leveling out this fall number.

35
36 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's why I say it just shows me no
37 concern.

38
39 MR. GUNDERSON: More and more nesting pairs are staying
40 down further south, too, and up around the Seal Islands. I don't
41 know much about the Cinder River area, but I fish all up into the
42 Seal Islands and the mouth, right around Nelson Lagoon and all
43 those areas. And the people that work those areas noticed more
44 and more emperors staying there every year, probably second or
45 third generation, you know. the birds are just apt not to even
46 leave the area. So.....

47
48 MR. KING: It could become part of the breeding segment
49 of the population right there. We have conducted intensive
50 transect surveys in '93, '4 and '5 on the Alaska Peninsula and

000106

1 picked up a few emperors, but not many. But again, that's
2 transect.....

3
4 MR. GUNDERSON: I think that number is increasing quite
5 a bit over the last few years, especially with the later
6 breakups, spring breakups up north, too. It makes, you know.....

7
8 MR. KING: I think if we saw -- I mean we would know if
9 we would see and we get lots of reports if we were talking 20,000
10 birds.....

11
12 MR. GUNDERSON: Yeah.

13
14 MR. KING:but I agree, there's probably some birds
15 there, several hundreds maybe.

16
17 MR. GUNDERSON: Probably. I would say that probably
18 would be a safe number.

19
20 MR. KING: But for the rest of the other half we don't
21 know what happens to them or.....

22
23 MR. GUNDERSON: Yeah.

24
25 MR. KING:what they're doing or how their habitat
26 is. Yes, sir?

27
28 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Do you think there could be a minimal
29 harvest in the fall for these birds for subsistence?

30
31 MR. KING: I guess I don't know what that number would
32 be, but like I said, I would think there's probably some areas
33 that could sustain some subsistence harvest.

34
35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Because it looks to me like it's been
36 pretty consistent for quite a few years there in the fall.

37
38 MR. KING: Like I said, this year is 68,000.

39
40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Oh, not '86.

41
42 MR. KING: '98. See, '98 isn't on there yet.

43
44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's not on there.

45
46 MR. KING: We just finished it so I didn't get '98 on
47 there.

48
49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Oh, okay.

50

000107

1 MR. KING: If you put '98 on the right it would be
2 68,000.

3
4 MR. LUKIN: What (indiscernible - away from
5 microphone).....

6
7 MR. KING: Pardon?

8
9 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: What number are you looking for? I mean
10 as I'm -- I'm just trying to figure in my own mind. When I look
11 at this graph here things look pretty stable. What am I missing?
12 Are you expecting to have a three year count higher than this?

13
14 MR. KING: Right. As I explained, our only management
15 number is the spring count. So you have to go over to the page
16 behind that one, and that's the only number that we're using for
17 management. The only reason we do a fall count is that we
18 include that with our aerial photographs of flocks of young birds
19 to get a productivity estimate. That's the only reason we do a
20 fall count. The real count is the one for the spring emperor
21 goose population, and that number has to be three year average of
22 80,000.

23
24 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Why do you select the spring count?

25
26 MR. KING: Because we feel that's a better representation
27 of the population on a whole. When we get to the spring that
28 population represents birds that are breeding and birds that are
29 possibly breeding, maybe too young this year. But it removes all
30 of the mortality from winter. So we feel that's the time of year
31 when we should use that number for an estimate.

32
33 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Is that not also the time of year which,
34 of course, mating/pairing begins and different migrations or
35 different movement when they're going to set up house, as you
36 say, for the summer?

37
38 MR. KING: Staging we call it.

39
40 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yeah.

41
42 MR. KING: Yes, sir.

43
44 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So isn't that definitely going to give
45 us this fluctuation because we don't know where they go?

46
47 MR. KING: No, because we picked the time of year when
48 everything north of the Alaska Peninsula is basically frozen so
49 there are no birds going north. So we know that they have to be
50 south of say, Cape Newenham. There's two bays there, Cape

000108

1 Newenham, you know, west of Togiak. There's no habitat for them
2 farther north. It's frozen. So they have to be somewhere in
3 that area. And that's where we try to count.

4
5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I've got another question then. Are all
6 these young birds from the year before, I mean do they come back
7 to the nesting area with the adults or do they stay in summer
8 areas?

9
10 MR. KING: From the studies.....

11
12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Could that be some of the decline in the
13 spring count?

14
15 MR. KING: No. From the studies we've done with Neck
16 banding some transmitters, no satellites however, it takes about
17 three years before the birds -- emperor geese breed. They have
18 to be three years old before they breed. So that's three years
19 that they spend somewhere, whatever you want to call it, loafing,
20 forming pair bonds, getting ready to be productive. In general
21 when birds are ready to breed -- when they're ready to nest
22 they're directly tied into photo length period of the spring, you
23 know. And so they're the ones that want to appear on the
24 breeding grounds first. Now, the other segment of the population
25 that is not breeding basically doesn't have the same drive. And
26 so they are the ones that are more likely to lag behind the
27 breeding segment of the population. They'll generally show up in
28 the area later on, but they're stage with the breeding birds as
29 near as we can tell from some of our neck banding and resighting
30 studies, they stage with the birds, the breeding population, but
31 they don't follow onto the Delta as fast as those birds that are
32 already paired. And pairing of birds of emperor geese takes
33 place in the winter. That's when the pair bonds are formed. So
34 they're all ready to go when spring comes, they're ready to go.
35 And they're ready to return to wherever they were raised.

36 What happens is -- this is just a little side note.
37 Basically in water fowl where the female was raised that's where
38 the pair will return to breed. So at any rate, a pair are ready
39 to go to breed and they're the first ones back on the delta. And
40 yes, the non-breeding birds would hesitate -- they're more likely
41 to hesitate on the Peninsula.

42
43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But they do all return to the nesting
44 area?

45
46 MR. KING: As near as we can tell, yes. from neck band
47 resightings they eventually show up in molting flocks on the
48 Yukon Delta. But as I stated before, we can only account for
49 about half the population on the Yukon Delta. Where the other
50 half goes we can only guess.

000109

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah. I'm just trying to see some kind
2 of reason why there's a big difference.....

3
4 MR. KING: It's very difficult.

5
6 MR. SQUARTSOFF:between the spring and fall.

7
8 MR. KING: It's a difficult situation and especially when
9 you don't have high numbers. And when you have a population such
10 as emperor geese that is so complex in not only its breeding but
11 also its wintering strategies. Whereas all other species breed
12 in the arctic and go south for the winter. And we can -- you
13 know, we can sit down and we can close seasons. We can buy state
14 refuges (ph). We can provide food. We can leave food crops in.
15 Just like the cackling goose and it went up like this. But the
16 emperors we don't have that option right now. We can't find out
17 other than wintering mortality and winter situations why those
18 birds aren't increasing. We don't think there's that much take
19 on the bird. So that's why it's very difficult to answer a lot
20 of questions on them.

21
22 But I think it behooves us to be cautious in our efforts
23 to take more than the population can sustain. And at this point
24 breeding birds are really susceptible to spring situations where
25 they could, you know, be harvested, and then having the worse
26 scenario. We don't know what the spring take is in Russia. We
27 don't have any control there. So that's, like I say, another
28 half of the population problem.

29
30 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Do we know what it will sustain though?
31 I mean when I see these numbers it doesn't tell me that they're
32 totally different than the land animals, but yet we have an idea
33 what the area will sustain.

34
35 MR. KING: Historically we have some estimates of over or
36 near 150,000.

37
38 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That was way before '81 then?

39
40 MR. KING: That's correct. In the '60s.

41
42 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum.

43
44 MR. KING: So we know the population significantly
45 higher. But we didn't have consistent annual surveys to document
46 it. It was just opportunity to survey the Peninsula and the same
47 types of habitat and that's the number they come up with.

48
49 MR. GUNDERSON: It was what, '76 or '77 when they come
50 into Nelson Lagoon and started an extensive program of working

000110

1 and counting, setting up the collars, banding?

2

3 MR. KING: '86.

4

5 MR. GUNDERSON: No, it was 20 years ago.

6

7 MR. KING: Well, Margaret Peterson and Gill.....

8

9 MR. GUNDERSON: Margaret Peterson and Bob Gill.

10

11 MR. KING: Yeah. But the real intensive neck banding was
12 on the Yukon Delta in the late '80s and early '90s.

13

14 MR. GUNDERSON: Yes, but the preliminary work started
15 in.....

16

17 MR. KING: Sure.

18

19 MR. GUNDERSON: '76 or '77 because I did a lot of
20 work with them during those first few years. And at that time
21 they numbers were down in their sixties.

22

23 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Excuse me, but boy, we have kind of
24 overshot.....

25

26 MR. KING: I'm sorry. I appreciate your time.

27

28 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes, it just kind of got away from us
29 here. And we are already past due what we had hoped to, but
30 appreciate your time. I don't mean to run you off.

31

32 MR. KING: Thank you.

33

34 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I guess we need to basically go on here
35 and establish a place for the next meeting. Pardon me?

36

37 MR. EDENSHAW: Mr. Chairman, on the calendar here for
38 March 4th and 5th, I serve with the Seward Penn, so that's on a
39 Thursday and Friday. And the latter part of the month that's
40 already on the calendar for March 16th through the 18th, which is
41 Southeast and the March 23rd and 24th is Southcentral. Rachel
42 and Robert both serve for those two teams there.

43

44 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Why do we always get the brunt of it?
45 Everybody else has got their meetings set up and we're left over
46 with the crumbs. I'm kind of getting tired of the crumbs. It's
47 a legitimate question, is it not?

48

49 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because you didn't make the meeting
50 in Cold Bay.

000111

1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If we'd have the meeting in Cold Bay
2 we'd have been first.

3
4 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: No, I'm not going to cry over it. I'm
5 just asking a simple question why we never get a choice. We've
6 always got to lick up the crumbs.

7
8 MS. MASON: I have a suggestion for you. If you take the
9 first slot then you would get the first choice. You would meet
10 first before all these other Councils do, then that would.....

11
12 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Sure. That's in February.

13
14 MS. MASON: February 22nd is when the window opens.

15
16 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Uh-hum. I'm game for trying it.
17 February, does anyone have a problem with the February meeting.
18 What part of the week is best? Is there any best or worst times,
19 Council?

20
21 MS. MASON: The people that make the travel arrangements
22 have been very -- often suggested that we meet in the middle of
23 the week rather than towards the beginning or the end, so Tuesday
24 are better than Monday, and Thursday are better than Friday.

25
26 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Do we plan on two days or one day,
27 Chief?

28
29 MR. EDENSHAW: Well, that's all contingent on proposals.
30 The proposal period is open to October 23rd and if there are
31 additional proposals from the Council, then it would behoove us
32 to meet for two days.

33
34 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Okay. Would you like to shoot for
35 February 24th this time then, all things equal?

36
37 MR. CRATTY: Yeah.

38
39 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Any objection? What?

40
41 MR. EDENSHAW: Is that for the start, the 24th?

42
43 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes.

44
45 MR. EDENSHAW: Okay. Then maybe I can possibly suggest
46 that maybe like on the Tuesday or Thursday afternoon to start,
47 you know, make it a day and a half versus two whole days.

48
49 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: And we missed the training here this
50 last meeting.....

000112

1 MR. EDENSHAW: That's correct.

2

3 CHAIRMAN OLSEN:so we need to incorporate that
4 hopefully with our next meeting, correct?

5

6 MR. EDENSHAW: Correct.

7

8 MR. CRATTY: So three days?

9

10 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I would hope that would only take a half
11 a day?

12

13 MR. EDENSHAW: Correct, half a day.

14

15 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: So should we shoot for the 24th -- no
16 objections heard, so be it. Where at?

17

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Does it have to be on Kodiak Island?

19

20 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: It doesn't have to be anywhere.

21

22 MR. SQUARTSOFF: One in the Aleutians and then one
23 in.....

24

25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: We try to space them equally,
26 absolutely, I believe in that. Is there -- I heard somebody
27 talking Port Lions.

28

29 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Port Lions, I'm talking Larsen Bay
30 because of the bear proposals and that's where most of the bears
31 are harvested. So I'd like to see some input from them people in
32 Larsen Bay.

33

34 MR. GUNDERSON: If anybody wants geese, let's go to
35 Nelson Lagoon.

36

37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Does Larsen Bay have the.....

38

39 MR. SQUARTSOFF: We have lodges.

40

41 MR. CRATTY: What's coming out west for the bear -- I
42 mean coming up in the Aleutian area on the proposals?

43

44 MR. WILLIS: Mr. Chair.

45

46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Yes.

47

48 MR. WILLIS: Rachel jumped in about the dates, I'll jump
49 in about the location. It's also been suggested that it's much
50 better to have our winter meetings in travel hubs where access

000113

1 is, you know, where airplanes can get in and out rather than pick
2 a winter site somewhere in a more remote location. It's been
3 suggested to us, I think it's probably a good idea, we saw what
4 happened to King Cove this fall. And the winter meetings are
5 really more crucial meetings than the fall meetings for this
6 Council because that's when you make your recommendations on
7 proposals that go to the Board.

8
9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: The King Cove one wasn't because of the
10 location it was because people couldn't make it. I mean people
11 were doing other things. It wasn't because of King Cove weather
12 or anything because I was there.

13
14 MR. WILLIS: I stand corrected on that. But any rate, we
15 have difficulty getting people there.

16
17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: It always is, it seems to be.

18
19 MR. WILLIS: Anyway, that's been suggested that we try to
20 concentrate on hitting the local villages for fall meetings when
21 the weather's generally better and the timing is less crucial if
22 we do have to cancel the meeting or reschedule as opposed to the
23 spring when two weeks after the window closes we have a Staff
24 Committee meeting and then we got the Board meeting, so we're on
25 a much tighter time table then.

26
27 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's why we moved it to February.

28
29 MR. WILLIS: February 24th and 25th is fine for the date.

30
31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I would like to see it in one of the
32 villages because those are the people that are using the
33 resources and that's what these proposals are for, is those
34 people that are using these bears. And then people can't make it
35 in, a lot of them can't come in because of where they live.

36
37 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Well, I would suggest then if we're
38 looking at Port Lion or even Larsen Bay, we could use that but
39 use Kodiak as the alternate. That we would at least have enough
40 people there to meet our quorum and conduct our meeting. I think
41 that would be a Plan B.

42
43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'd go with that. But I mean I'd like
44 to give the people in the village a chance.....

45
46 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Absolutely.

47
48 MR. SQUARTSOFF:to have some input.

49
50 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: That's our purpose. How would you like

000114

1 to see it then, Port Lions, Larsen Bay. Personally I think.....

2

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Well, Larsen Bay harvested three bears
4 and Old Harbor harvested two and Port Lion did zero but it
5 doesn't matter to me, I'd just like to see it in the village. My
6 preference would be Larsen Bay. I don't know how Ivan would feel
7 about that.

8

9 MR. CRATTY: Ivan won't care. Larsen Bay is fine.

10

11 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Larsen Bay, okay.

12

13 MS. SHELLIKOFF: Fine.

14

15 MR. CRATTY: Fine.

16

17 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: We got Larsen Bay with Kodiak as an
18 alternative should weather or other problems arise.

19

20 MR. EDENSHAW: And that will Wednesday afternoon half day
21 and then Thursday all day; is that correct?

22

23 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

24

25 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Public comments. Staff comments. Mr.
26 Stovall, please.

27

28 MR. STOVALL: I wanted to thank the Council for letting
29 me give my input into the proposals and I really appreciate their
30 comments. I'm going to make sure that those comments do make it
31 back to the powers that be at the Refuge and we'll see what we
32 can do about shoring them up a little bit and making them a
33 little bit more tenable.

34

35 I wanted to bring, just before we forget, Tab E, the
36 migratory birds are going -- the Migratory Birds Subsistence
37 Forums are going to be held in various areas of the State of
38 Alaska, but there does not look like there will be any in Kodiak.
39 And it doesn't look like there's going to be any in the Aleutian
40 Chain area. You may want to consider contacting, I guess it's
41 Bob Stevens, Migratory Bird Management, about trying to set
42 something up, at the very minimum, one of those two areas or both
43 areas to have these experts come and discuss and give your input
44 back to them. So that your input can be used as part of these
45 management bodies that are being discussed here.

46

47 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: I'll appoint Peter to -- no.....

48

49 MR. STOVALL: But I just thought I'd bring that to your
50 attention before we leave. Thank you once again.

000115

1 CHAIRMAN OLSEN: Thank you. I would just like to say, as
2 usual, it is a pleasure to be with such a working group of people
3 here. I have been here when times weren't as good and feelings
4 seem to erupt a little more quick, as well as myself. And I
5 thank the Council for their confidence and to reelecting me
6 Chair. I do find it sometimes a little difficult with my
7 schedules to deal with. I enjoy the challenge and in working
8 with the different people and organizations to try to get some
9 things through my skull that are not always understood. I do
10 appreciate the patience and the time that they take to try to
11 help me to understand. And I hope the sharing is equal. So with
12 that, I would like to hear any other comments; if not, we'd like
13 to move for adjournment.

14
15 Okay, thank you.

16
17 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

18
19 * * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

) ss.

STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena Hile, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 115 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Kodiak/Aleutians Regional Subsistence Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by myself on the 14th day of October 1998, beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at Days Inn, Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed by Meredith Downing, Rebecca Nelms and myself to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 23rd day of October, 1998.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: